

SOME ASPECTS OF THE HOUSING PROBLEM

THE problem of the decent housing of the poor, and even of those workers who would resent being described as such, is so manifestly and confessedly urgent that to emphasize its importance would be merely a case of "pushing at an open door." It is, however, a problem which needs much more than good will for its solution; and the very prominence which it has assumed in the public mind may well be fraught with very real danger, unless certain cautions are observed by those who undertake to discuss it. It is indeed not one problem but a group of problems, which differ greatly among themselves according to the manifold diversities of local conditions. And the danger is lest either as the result of ill-judged attempts to secure uniformity, or as the outcome of optimistic demands, met by rash promises which may prove impossible of fulfilment, a grievous and wide-spread disappointment may ensue, with consequences such as it is impossible to anticipate without alarm.

For this reason, coupled with the consideration that in such matters experience is a better teacher than theory, I propose in the following pages to give in the first instance some account of what has been actually done in the matter of housing by the City Council of Liverpool, as throwing valuable light on the question as to how the problem may best be dealt with under circumstances similar to those of that city.¹ This is, of course, only one branch of the subject, but it is, I am convinced, only by dealing with it piecemeal that sound practical conclusions can be reached. And if I have selected the operations carried out in Liverpool for special treatment, this is because on several grounds they appear to me to have quite special claims on the attention of all who are interested, or may be induced to take an interest, in the matter. The story of the task which has been achieved

¹ The facts and figures given in the following pages are taken from the *Report of the Housing Committee of the Liverpool City Council for 1913*, issued in 1914. Some further details are given in two addresses by Ald. Austin Harford, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, printed in 1916 and 1917.

by the Liverpool Housing Committee is the record of an effort which, before the outbreak of the present war had already extended over a period of half a century (1864—1913); and of an effort carried out on a very large scale, involving, as it then had, an expenditure of more than £1,100,000, and providing, in a total of 2,747 dwellings, house-room for a population of more than 10,000, of whom, moreover, more than 8,000 were persons who had actually been dislodged from their old, insanitary tenements in the immediate neighbourhood. This last point is of quite special significance, and will be dealt with, below, under the head of "restricted tenancy."

Already in 1864 it had become evident to those who had the public welfare at heart that, partly in consequence of the large and sudden Irish immigration of the famine years (1846—47) but largely also as the result of the readiness of avaricious speculators to exploit for their own gains the miseries of the poor, the overcrowding, the insanitary conditions of large sections of the city, constituted nothing short of "a gigantic menace to the health and well-being of the community." Accordingly, in virtue of the special powers conferred by the "Liverpool Sanitary Amendment Act" passed in that year, the Housing Committee forthwith took in hand the preliminary work of clearing away the worst of the slums; and out of a total of 22,000 houses then and subsequently condemned as insanitary, more than 19,000 had been demolished, and the fate of the remaining 2,700 had been already sealed, before December 31, 1913.

The real interest of the Council's operations lies, however, in its constructive work, which was not taken in hand, except on a very small scale, till 1885, when the huge block of dwellings known as "Victoria Square" was opened, shortly followed by others in Juvenal Street and Arley Street. These first attempts are indeed mentioned only for the sake of completeness; for they suffered from two serious and all but fatal defects. The buildings are altogether too barrack-like, and they were promptly occupied, and are occupied to this day, by people of a very different class from those for whose benefit they were intended. Accordingly, from 1896 onwards a new and much more hopeful and successful policy has been pursued. Not only are the dwellings erected since that date in all respects more homelike, but no one is admitted as a tenant unless he

can show that he has been actually dislodged by the carrying out of the Council's improvement schemes.

It is, then, the buildings erected from 1896 to 1913, and occupied under conditions of "restricted tenancy," which must chiefly engage our attention. The total number, rehoused under these conditions amounted, in December, 1913, to 8,400 persons. Of these the greater number occupy the large district lying immediately to the west of Limekiln Lane and Scotland Road, of which Summer Seat, Bevington Street, Burlington Street, and Hornby Street, are the principal arteries. This district, formerly a region of noisome slums, has now deservedly become—though not designed for show—one of the show places of the city, with its broad streets, slightly frontages (none more than three storeys in height), spacious "backs," and large playgrounds. Each dwelling is of course furnished with the most approved sanitary appliances, in the provision of which experience has led to various improvements in detail as the work has proceeded.

It is eminently satisfactory to note that "as a result of the re-housing policy of the Housing Committee, the general death-rate on the areas dealt with has fallen by more than one half, and the average death-rate from phthisis has dropped from 3.9 to 1.9, or from nearly four to less than two per thousand." And the criminal statistics for the same areas show a corresponding improvement. As bearing on the question of temperance (by which I do *not* mean total abstinence) I may quote a single instance, communicated to me in course of conversation by the genial caretaker of the Hornby Street Area. Within this area, in days gone by, five public-houses did a roaring trade. Of these five, only one survives, and whereas it was confidently predicted that the custom of the other four would simply be transferred to the favoured survivor, its manager has declared, and has been able to make good his statement by showing his books, that he does less business now than when he had four competitors, adding, however, that he is well content with the change, for that under present conditions he is saved the expense of engaging the services of a stalwart "chucker-out."

Now no one, it may be assumed, would be so credulous as to believe that the work of the Liverpool Housing Committee has been flawless, or that there are no drawbacks to be debited as an offset against the great and manifest boons which the

Committee has conferred on the community. Just as in war a victory cannot be gained except at the cost of casualties, so in every public undertaking good results must be balanced against others which are less desirable, and the best that is to be hoped for in an imperfect world is a clear balance of advantages over disadvantages.

Among the drawbacks to the Liverpool scheme I will not reckon the fact that the population per acre in the municipal dwellings is greater than would be suitable in a less populous town. The men for whom they are built, dock-labourers, firemen, carters, and so forth, need to live near their work, which lies along the docks, and they would not thank you for a pretty cottage in the suburbs three miles or more away.

But it is a serious matter that of the dwellings erected so very large a proportion should be three-roomed or even two-roomed flats. Of the former there are just 1,000 (998), of the latter 1,257, of four-roomed dwellings barely 273. Of course for a single man, or for a young married couple who have as yet no children, it may be better that they should be content with two rooms for awhile, and put by a fair proportion of their earnings for the needs of days to come. But, for a married couple with a growing family, it should be obvious that nothing short of four rooms can be regarded as sufficient for the ordinary requirements of decency. The answer to questions addressed in course of conversation to the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, and the Buildings' Surveyor, was to the effect that even families which could well afford the 6s. rental of a four-roomed dwelling will not take it if a three-roomed tenement is to be had anywhere in the neighbourhood. How far this state of things may be immediately remediable by means of a by-law, it will perhaps be wiser not to decide without a closer knowledge of local conditions than—I should suppose—most of my readers possess. The authorities on the spot look forward to better things in the future, but hitherto have deemed it wiser not to force the pace.

Here, then, is drawback number one. And the second is this. The total cost of the dwellings erected and opened under the aforesaid condition of "restricted tenancy," down to December, 1913, was £636,000, of which rather more than one-third (£234,000) represented the cost of the land, and rather less than two-thirds (£402,000) that of the buildings. Now on this capital expenditure the net return, after deducting the

expenses of administration and upkeep, is slightly less than 1·5 per cent. And in as much as money cannot be borrowed, even for housing purposes, at such a rate of interest, it necessarily follows that the municipal dwellings involve a yearly deficit or net charge which must be somehow met. At present the charge falls on the rates, and, in regard to the "restricted dwellings," it amounted, in 1917, to nearly £19,000.¹

Now this,—not of course the precise figure, but the fact of an annual deficit on the Liverpool housing schemes—is a bed-rock truth which it is important to bear in mind. For, taking the country round, with every allowance for the more favourable conditions with regard to the assessment of site values which may prevail elsewhere, or may come to prevail everywhere, and with every allowance for the more favourable terms under which it may become possible to borrow the needful capital, there can, I fear, be no reasonable doubt that when municipalities undertake the task of building workmen's dwellings, and of letting them at rents within the means of workers of the lowest grade, the direct financial result must needs in many localities take the form of an annual charge which must somehow be met.

Nor can we safely venture to affirm—though it may of course be hoped—that the difficulty will be, so to say, automatically solved by an all-round improvement in the wages of lower-grade labour. For it is at least possible that such a general rise in wages may so far enhance the cost of building, that the payment of an economic rent for municipal dwellings will, in some towns at least, continue to be as much beyond the reach of the average unskilled labourer as it would be in Liverpool to-day. How far the "restricted dwellings" in Liverpool are from paying an economic rent may be judged from the fact that, in 1913, the net rental (£9,000) amounted to just one-third of the annual charge (£27,000) for interest and sinking fund. The present uneconomic rental stands at an average of eighteen pence per room per week.

¹ The total charge on the rates in 1913, taking into account the unrestricted dwellings, the compensation paid for demolition under the Liverpool Act of 1864, and "Works in Progress," was, in round numbers £34,000 (*Report*, p. 89), representing a rate of 2½d. in the pound. In consequence of the suspension of building operations during the war, and of continued payments to the sinking fund, the charge on the rates had fallen, in 1917, to the figures given above.

Here then is a question, not for Liverpool alone, but for the whole country, viz., the question: By whom is such a deficit, when it occurs and while it occurs, to be made good? In Liverpool, as has been seen, it has been made a burden on the rates, a burden which, when building operations are resumed after the war, would, under the old conditions, necessarily become heavier year by year, until it is at least possible that it might at last reach the limit beyond which it would become intolerable.

Now it is not my intention to cast any slur on the Liverpool City Council in this matter, for no other course was open to them. But that the burden should fall either wholly or mainly on the ratepayers as a body, except under pressure of extreme necessity, is surely unreasonable, not to say iniquitous. Why should the occupier of a house at a weekly rental of, say seven and sixpence, be called upon to contribute towards the expense of enabling his neighbour to rent, at five or six shillings per week, a dwelling of which the economic rent would be almost or quite as high as that of his own house?

Nor is the difficulty met by saying: The question is a national not a local one, and the cost should be defrayed not by the local authority but by the State or the Government. And, as we all know, proposals if not actual promises, have been made of most efficacious aid from the very highest quarters. But "State-aid," whether in the form of downright grants or of redeemable loans, is a term with which men are too prone, at the present day, unconsciously to juggle. The State, or the Government, even though it should be a Labour Government, does not and cannot possess a penny piece beyond what it takes from the pockets of its citizens; and if it cannot raise even a war loan at less than five per cent., it plainly cannot afford to lend, for housing purposes, at four per cent. or less, except by devising some means of recouping itself for the loss thereby incurred. Hence the need, to which reference was made at the outset, of moderating our expectations of assistance from the public purse; and hence the question, which necessarily and persistently recurs to the mind of any one who is not content to use words as counters: *From whose pockets is the money to be taken?*

It is of no use to say: We have spent so much on the war that we can surely afford to lay out a much smaller sum on the

crying needs of peace. What we have done during the war has been to pile up, at a high rate of interest, an enormous debt, which it will take more than a generation to pay off, and in the paying off of which it is greatly to be feared that the poor, and persons of very limited means, will be in one way or another severely mulcted in order to swell the enormous fortunes of the chief lenders, the super-rich financiers. That indeed, is a topic which may seem to lie outside my immediate subject. It is mentioned here, partly in order to illustrate the truth that the housing problem cannot be adequately treated apart from the more general question of the national finance, but also in order to emphasize the urgent importance of not needlessly adding—even for the purpose of housing schemes—to the burden which, after the war, the poor, and the less wealthy among the middle classes, will be compelled to bear. And so, even on the hypothesis that the financial difficulty which besets the issue of redeemable loans for a superior type of town-planning and building can be met, I am brought back to the question, with special reference to that particular aspect of the housing problem which presents itself in the humblest quarters of Liverpool and other large cities: From whose pockets should these funds be taken which will be needed for the housing of our poorer workers at uneconomic rents?

It seems to me that the bulk of the burden should rightfully fall on three classes of persons, viz., the super-rich as such, the owners of sites at present occupied by insanitary property, and the employers of lower-grade labour. That the immoderately rich, whose colossal fortunes are a growing menace to the common weal, will in the near future be more heavily super-taxed than at present, may perhaps be taken for granted; and in particular it may be hoped that application of the principle of the "excess profits tax" will be so widened and deepened that profits may be reduced all round to that minimum which is requisite as an inducement to industrial enterprise. And one among the many purposes to which the revenue thence arising may be most suitably appropriated will of course be the housing of the poorest of our people. But, apart from this more general source of national income, there is a special reason why the assessment of site-values in the case of insanitary property should be reduced to a minimum. The value of city land is obviously factitious, and whatever credit may conceivably be due to others, assuredly none is

due to any laudable efforts on the part of the owners of such property. And, in so far as the rental of cottages or tenement houses may fairly be taken as a determining element in the process of assessment for compensation, the rental to be taken into account should be, not that which the owners have hitherto drawn, but that which they might have expected to draw if the buildings on their property had not been unduly huddled together and over-crowded. And yet again, seeing that the provision of dwellings at uneconomic rents is needed exclusively for the benefit of those lower-grade workers who must of necessity live in the near neighbourhood of their occupation, it would seem to be only fair that a special housing-tax or housing-rate should be levied on the employers of lower-grade labour as such. For it is their interests which are most directly served by the provision of house-room for their own employees.

For other workers, more highly skilled and better paid, it will on every ground be desirable that dwellings should be provided, at economic rents, in less congested districts, and, as far as possible, in the suburbs—garden suburbs let us hope—of our great cities, with facilities for cheap and rapid transit to the place of their employment. Costly building schemes, of the sort that do not “pay their way,” like those of the Liverpool Housing Committee, should be confined to districts in which the economic conditions are more or less closely analogous to those of Liverpool. But the amenities of garden suburbs, and their many and manifest advantages, must not blind us to the truth that they are not universally suitable. And it is because I believe that conditions closely analogous to those of Liverpool must necessarily continue to prevail at least in our seaport towns, and probably in many others also, that it has seemed worth while to study carefully—though in less detail than I could have wished—the object-lesson provided by the Liverpool Housing Committee during the half-century covered by its operations.

In conclusion, lest in dealing almost exclusively with one aspect of the housing problem I should seem to have left all others out of sight, I would, at least in general terms, express my very cordial agreement with most of what may be read in the manual entitled *The Housing Problem*, edited by Mr. Leslie Toke, and published by P. S. King and Son for the Catholic Social Guild.

In particular I would lay stress on the immense importance (as it seems to me) of giving every encouragement to what are called "public utility societies," that is to say, to housing associations run on co-operative or co-partnership lines. Whatever form the proposals of the present or any future Government may take, in the matter of the power of compulsory acquisition of building sites, or in that of the advance, by way of loan, of the needful capital, it is much to be desired that these powers and facilities should be granted—under due guarantees of course—to "public utility societies," on precisely the same terms on which they are accorded to municipal authorities. A healthy independence of officialdom and of amateur patronage is by all means to be encouraged in these bureaucratic days. The business of the housing of the workers of the nation may, if it be wisely handled by themselves, take us a long step towards a system of decentralized and sane self-government, the government of the people by the people and for the people, following upon centuries of legislation and administration mainly by the rich and for the rich. Of course the day may dawn when some kind of federation or amalgamation of the various associations of "Tenants Limited," and the like, will become possible, desirable, or even, for self-defence, necessary. But as the great Trade Union movement, with its splendid record of achievement, had its origin in local labour-clubs and benefit societies, so it may be hoped that co-operative building, and the co-partnership owning of cottage or house property, ultimately on a very extensive scale, will grow from below upwards, and will be found to have had its first beginnings in independent local associations. These surely should prove excellent schools in which may be learned the invaluable art of self-government.

HERBERT LUCAS.

SOME ETYMOLOGICAL "IDYLLS AND STORIES"

WHY are "Trilby" hats worn with a tarn on top, as if to catch rain-water? For the sake, it will perhaps be answered, of more easily handling them. Whatever the reason, it has probably been forgotten; and the custom has endured on the score, not of convenience, but of *convention*. This term well exemplifies its own meaning. From the notion of men coming together, as for purposes of deliberation, *conventions* naturally come to signify the resolutions drawn up. But without actual concourse, or literal assemblage, there can be concurrence in opinion or in sentiment; and *conventional* is applied, therefore, to the results of tacit popular agreement. A thing is said or done wholly or chiefly because it is looked upon by others as being "the thing" to say or do. As an institution, language originates, of course, not in convention of any kind but in nature; in their several developments of meaning, nevertheless, words tend to be *conventionalized*—to be used as quasi-algebraic symbols, from which the early imagery has wholly died away. Of the curious results in which this tendency often issues, readers of THE MONTH have already been reminded;¹ in the present article, though this aspect of word-history will not be ignored, we shall try to discover the twofold intimate relation in which, contrary to all appearance of structure and of surface-meaning, certain words originally stood to one another. To discover this relation, it will be necessary to speak of verbal roots. Far from being the sheer drudgery that folk often imagine, the extraction of such roots, though not, perhaps, to be commended as an after-dinner substitute for *bézique* or for billiards, can yet be so performed as to become a genuine pastime. Such, at any rate, is the writer's conviction; and on the strength of it he has ventured to offer two or three examples of how to play the game. First, however, to define roughly a root:—A monosyllable which, whether in one or in more than one tongue, has gone to the making of several words, with the same elementary meaning for each of

¹ THE MONTH, July, 1917. "The Bond of Language" (page 38, first line).

them.¹ When a root—or, for that matter, a word—enters into different tongues, it does so, of course, conformably to their respective requirements: in each of them it is received *secundum modum recipientis*. Thus, what in a Greek mouth was *thermós*, attuned itself to the Latin utterance as *fermus*. Viewed in their mutual affinity, the two forms (to fall back on a previous analogy) differ from one another much as the Somerset from the Lancashire pronunciation of an identical word: nobody would say that *vather* (if that be the Somerset) is quite a distinct word from *feither*. So, too, with the root of *wit*-ch—a root not literally, of course, but typically, the same as that of Latin *vid*-ere. "Type" is here understood logically, not chronologically: community of type need not imply *descent from* a common prototype. It is perhaps open to dispute whether the Aryan offshoot languages sprang from a common uniform original, or whether the Aryan original itself existed from the first in a state of some dialectical fluidity.² But this question is beside our present purpose; nor is it here of any consequence under which dialectic form a root be quoted. Having made these stipulations, we shall henceforth take leave to speak of (say) a Greek and an English word having a common root, or of finding their (etymological) G.C.M.

As a first example may be taken the case of two words between which, neither in phonetic structure nor in surface-meaning, is there a shred of resemblance. Snakes are readily associated with *delirium tremens*; but what on earth, or in the water, has an *eel* got to do with *quinsy*? Eels, to be sure, are in some sort snakes, and are indeed known provincially as

¹ Root is here used in its very widest sense. Readers will easily distinguish, when need arises, between the root of a word and a root in the word. Thus in *o-ther*, the comparative of *one*, the main root is traced in the *o*; but the suffix *-ther*, a minor element, itself contains the root *-tur*, which—meaning "through" or "across"—is found in English *through*, *thrill*, and even *nos-tril* (for *nos-thril*, i.e. hole through the nose), as also in Greek *teir-o* (pierce, drill), and *ter-ma*, besides Latin *tra*-ns (through or across) and *ter*-minus. The *term*, or end, or goal, is that to which a passage goes through; and a passage has to be made, in thought, through or over "one" in order to reach an "other." All comparison involves a similar transition; and the suffix *-ther* (cf. *whē-ther*, *fur-ther*) is found, modified by Grimm's Law, in Latin *al-ter*, *u-ter*, &c., as in Greek *pō-ter-os* and the like,—a good example of how a word, or fragment of one, becomes conventionalized. To a schoolboy the fragment here is just an algebraic symbol "signifying comparison." *Tar*, though not the root of *other*, is yet the common root of *other* and of *nostril*; whilst *let*, which shows the common root of *streamlet* and of *hamlet*, has the (main) root of neither.

² See Max Müller, *The Science of Language* (ed. 1899, new impression), Vol. II. pp. 184 and 190—192.

snigs—a word which, like *snake*, gives a glimpse of stealthy or *sneaking* movement, just as *reptile* and *serpent* hint at creeping or crawling. Snigs might just as aptly have been called snake-lets or sneak-lets; but the actual diminutive of *snake* has, instead, been kept for *snails* (Anglo-Saxon *snæg-el*, weakened from *snac-el*). In Latin, however, and (as *anguille*) in French, *anguilla* is used of an eel; and is the diminutive of *anguis*, the familiar name for a snake. In Greek an eel is *énchelys*, which is all but the same as *anguilla*.¹ The two chief elements are typically the same in both words—ay, and in *eel* itself, which contains, not only the diminutive factor, but a trace also of the root of *anguis*. This root may, for those who prefer Sanskrit frightfulness, be quoted as *angh*; in *eel*, however, and in the snake-names *aghi* (Sanskrit), *échis* and *échidna* (Greek), an un-nasal and perhaps earlier variety of the root is indicated. Between *anguilla* and *eel* there is this further difference: *Anguilla* was coined directly from *anguis*—the pieces were put together in Latin—whereas *eel*, which originally contained those pieces undamaged, existed as a ready-made diminutive long before English was dreamt of—indeed, before the Teutonic stock had thrown out even its main branches over N.W. Europe. Side by side with A.S. *æl* or our present *eel*, the word exists, in Danish, Dutch, and modern German, as *aal*. Before these peoples had lost touch with another, the early European *agla*² must already have been disembowelled in their utterance. Be all this, however, as it may, once more what have eels—or rather, as will appear, eels and hounds—to do with quinsy? Why were snakes called *angues*? For the same reason that some of the largest of them—"immensis orbibus angues"—are now called *boa-constrictors*; and it is with the implication of constriction or strangling, of compression or straitening, that the root of *anguis* appears likewise in Greek *áncho*, as in Latin *ango*, *anxius*, *angustiæ*, *angina*—this last word, indeed, now familiarly used for a heart-

¹ Neither from *échis*, of which it may be called the virtual diminutive, nor, presumably, from any other Greek noun has *énch-el-ys* been formed, as *angui(l)-la* from *anguis*—i.e., *énchelys* must have been put together before Greek, as such, was spoken. To call eels "throttler-kins" is not more absurd than for boxers to speak of a "ring" that is not circular.

² Very early forms like *ag-la*, which is given by Prof. Skeat, are, one imagines, inferred or "posited." In any case—even if, instead of being a presumptive ancestral word, *agla* had been an ancient verbal type, abstracted from a number of more or less different embodiments—the argument (whatever it be worth) would not suffer.

stifling, having formerly been used also for "a quinsy." Of this malady, an older form of the name, derived from the French, was *squinancy*. The *s* perished unlamented, seeing that it had no right to be there; for the word was corrupted from a curious Greek compound *cyn-* (cf. Latin *canis*; our *hound*) + *anche*, a compound meaning "dog-throttling."¹ Of *eel* and *quinsy*, therefore, which have not a single letter in common, the G.C.M. is the root of *anguis*. Q.E.D.

The next—and the last—example to be here worked out is drawn from the title of this paper: a title taken from an imaginary book of *Idylls and Stories*. Between these two nouns, there is, to be sure, a resemblance in meaning; but, if put into the singular number, they are spelt without a letter in common save *y*; and, in neither of them, does that vowel belong to the common root. This root has incidentally been cited, but probably the reader has forgotten it; so here, in last assemblage of English, are a number of words—natives cheek by jowl with naturalized aliens—in each of which the syllable can be traced: *witch*, *vision*, *prudent*, *idea*, *history*, *view*, *wise*, and—*tabloid*. How so motley an offspring can have had a common origin is not really hard to explain. *Story*, to begin with, is short for *history*, the *h* in which has replaced a long-lost sound—that of the digamma (F). *Histor* is for *wistor* or else for *vistor*, a word which was made pronounceable by putting *s* instead of *d*. Whether F had the sound more of a *v* or of a *w* is beside the point; safely, with Tony Weller, let us "put it down a *wee*." To its total disappearance from Greek, something analogous is found in the frequency with which *v* and *w* become mute in such English words, respectively, as *Evesham* and *Norwich*. In *idea* and *idyll*, therefore, the root is shorn of its old initial. Otherwise than by inserting *h*, such loss is sometimes made good by lengthening the vowel which immediately followed F. Thus for *Finos* (cf. Latin *vinum*) we have *oīnos*, and for *Fikos* (cf. *Hard-wick* and Latin *vicus*) *oīkos*: perhaps—though "we leave these things

¹ See Skeat, s.vv. *Eel* and *Quinsy*; also Max Müller, op. cit., Vol. I. p. 523. "Amhas [? anghas]," the latter says, in Sanskrit means "sin," but it does so only because it meant originally "throttling"—"the consciousness of sin being like the grasp of the assassin on the throat of his victim . . . In Gothic the same root [un-nasalized] has produced *ag-is*, in the sense of *fear*, and from this source we have *awe*, in awful, i.e., fearful, and *ug*, in *ugly*." The same ideas are linked together, by a different bond of thought, in the popular phrases "ugly as sin" and "ugly as snakes."

to the grammarians"—*eidos* points back to *Fidos*.¹ At all events, *eidos* comes from the root *Fid*, as Latin *species* from the root *spec*, and means "form": that under which a thing is "seen" or known. By adding *eidos* as if to a stem ending in *o*, words have been formed like *tabloid*—many of them ill-favoured and unabashed mongrels. Lastly, the Latin root *vid* is seen or traced in a number of words ultimately derived from *vid-eo*:—in *view* and *vision*, for example, as also in *prudent*, a shrunken form of *pro-vid-ent*.

Such, in outline, is a not uninteresting way of getting glimpses into the unsuspected history of words. The game, as we have dared to call it, can of course be made more complex as proficiency in playing it increases. From the Table of Contents prefixed to our imaginary book of *Idylls and Stories*, we take three headings which may furnish scope for some patient ingenuity:

- I. *The Surgeon's Doom.*
- II. *Organs on the Terrace.*
- III. *A Thirsty Synthesis.*

The six italicized words here given can be differently arranged in three new pairs, each pair having its own common root. What are the three roots? which are their respective pairs of offshoots? and *how* has each word been formed?

To the reader whom, if there be any such, it may amuse to work out this problem, we heartily exclaim, in respect of it, *Quod felix faustumque sit!*

T. M. WATERTON.

¹ The reservation with which this conjecture is made must be understood as applying to any other guess, or inference, of the writer's own hazarding. Actual etymologies have been carefully verified in Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary*. Acknowledgments not less frequent, though of a more general kind, are due to Max Müller's Lectures on *The Science of Language*.

PEACE AND WAR

THE last light fails, the punctual stars are lit,
Against the darkling hedge are glimmering white
Moon-lamps of elder-flower,—and all is still,
Save where the restless bats in zig-zags flit
Or the swift homeward beetle droning flies,
And all the scented dusk, with widening eyes,
Waits the wished coming of the tardy moon.
O thou that makest a day of night
Come! the midsummer midnight to fulfil
Come, Dian! crown the waiting brows of June!

It should be always June!
Always warm-breathing nights and a young moon
That knows white beams
Through latticed panes, aslant, on nursery floors
And kisses children sleeping in white beds
Blanching pink dimpled arms soft-thrown about their heads,
Filling their minds with happy-fearful dreams
Of darkling shadows behind secret doors
Leading to Bluebeard's chambers,—or the Dark Tower
To which Childe Roland came,—or the Enchanted Moat,
With moon-kissed waterlilies afloat,
That waits a thousand years the appointed hour!

It should be always June!
Always warm-breathing nights and a young moon;
Not the sharp crescent of the Huntress Queen
Ranging Orthyan woods, aloof, austere,
With sheavéd arrows silver-tipped and keen,
Who hath no ruth for man or sobbing deer,
But the soft orb that for Persephone
On Euna's flowery valleys golden shone
Before she knew the horrid realms of Dis
And made for her white feet a milky way
Or on hushed Patmos secret stooped to kiss
The blue-veined eyelids of Endymion!

It should be always June! Why comes there any cold
 Or snow or hail or bitter wind or rain?
 Why must the happy year grow sad and old?
 Why must all pleasure rooted be in pain
 And June's sweet breath
 Be drawn from, and return to,—Death?

.

O God! Who mad'st this boon and kindly Earth,
 Why didst Thou, almost at its birth,
 To that fair garden let the Serpent in?
 Why must the love-light kindled in Eve's eyes
 Be dimmed so soon with tears
 And all the lengthened days of Adam's years
 Be spaced and reckoned up in sighs?
 Why need there have been Sin?
 Or how was that a Happy Fault that yet—
 Even after Calvary—avails to fill
 The Earth with grief; makes brother brother kill;
 Bids the sick fields of France with blood be wet,—
 Yea, God! sees Man *less* kind since Jesus owned him kin!
 Lo! while I sit and breathe this scented air,
 See the soft Darkness, hear the Silence speak,
 Am wrapped about with Thine own peace;—out there
 Ten thousand other men of mothers born
 Lie maimed and rent and torn
 And this same air is filled with bloody reek,
 And this same darkness blinded with Death's glare,
 This silence deafened with shell's bursting shriek,
 And at that Moon their wide eyes, sightless, stare!

.

Dost thou believe in Me?

Yea, Lord, I do believe
 Thou art Almighty God. What Thou dost give,
 Or Death or Life, I equally receive.
 Yet would I know Thee, Lord, whilst yet I live.

Dost thou love Me?

Yea, Lord, I love Thee well
 Yet, if Love knew, Love could love better tell.

With thy whole Heart ?

Yea, Lord, with all my heart,
For of Thy love my love is but a part.

With thy whole Soul ?

Yea, Lord, with all my soul,
Yet doth the part still yearn to know the Whole.

With all thy Strength ?

Yea, Lord, with all my might,
Yet should my Strength be stronger were there light.

With all thy MIND ?

Yea, Lord,—but yet—but yet—
Forgive, Oh Lord, that chains their captives fret,
What doth avail Thy sunshine to the blind ?
Dost thou not see how this poor little mind
Beats with vain hands against its prison bars ?
See how they bleed ! I hold to Thee the scars !
See how, with purblind eyes, more dim with tears,
It looks out through the unlifting mists of years.
May I not strive to see—not wish to know
And nearer to Thee by that knowledge grow
While yet I live ?
All else, O Lord, I give. . . .

GIVE ME THAT TOO !

I will—I do !

H. W. BLISS.

THE POSITION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN RUSSIA UNDER THE SOVIETS

IT is hardly necessary, at this time of day, to expatiate at length upon the vast religious changes automatically brought about by the downfall of the Russian Tsardom. From the times of Vladimir the Great—the Photian Constantine (973–1015)—down to the very consummation of the Revolution, the history of the Catholic Church in Russia has been written in blood and tears; and he who runs may read it. True it is that, in 1905, as a consequence of the disastrous Russo-Japanese War, a so-called “Edict of Toleration,” very fair to behold, was hastily concocted and flung as a sop to the restive and long-suffering ‘Cerberus’ who was straining even then to burst asunder the chains that bound him; but not so easily does the Cæsarian leopard change his spots, and the Imperial policy of religious persecution and of gentle suasion by the leaded knout of the Cossack hordes—a form of *empresement* euphemistically known as “Russification”—went on pretty much as before. When, therefore, in 1914, the changes and chances of the war led the Russians into Galicia, the utterly barbarous methods employed—notably by Bobrinski and by the ill-famed “Orthodox” Archbishop Eulogus—with a view to the wholesale perversion of the Catholic population, showed only too plainly what would have been the ultimate fate of that country, from a religious point of view, if, as conditions then were, it had remained in the hands of that “holy Russia” hymned by the poet-novelist Dostoïevski² as “the Incarnation and the Missionary of the Christian Ideal.” Politics and the Cause of Democracy apart, we may easily

¹ We use this metaphor advisedly. Cerberus was, so to say, a composite beast; and the Russian Empire was a conglomerate, or mosaic, of separate States which had long been deprived of their ancient autonomy and independence, their identity and individual national life and religion, by the Imperialism of the Tsars.

² 1821–1881. Dostoïevski perpetually inveighs against “the rottenness of the Occident,” and calls upon Russia to suppress it by conquest and “Russification.”

conjecture what must have been the inevitable moral and religious consequences brought into being by the realization of the age-long spiritual ambition of the Tsars: an anti-Rome, with Byzantium as capital, extending in empire and influence over the whole of Eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Ægean Sea. Whatever may be thought of Revolutions in general, or of Revolutionaries in particular, we must acknowledge that the Catholic Church was in this case delivered from the menace of an appalling calamity. Whether that menace was immediate or remote, is an academic question which we need not pause to consider.

The first and most important result of the overthrow of the Orthodox Colossus, was the complete delivery of Christ's Church from the prison-house of centuries. M. Kerensky's "Provisionary Government" began by according her full and entire liberty in the nomination of bishops and parish priests, and in the foundation of seminaries, colleges and religious communities. Henceforth, every Religious Order, without exception, was free to establish its houses in Russia without let or hindrance from any man; the Church was empowered to re-establish dioceses that had been suppressed, and to found new bishoprics at her pleasure; the relations of the Episcopate with Rome were guaranteed immune from every kind of governmental control or interference.

Under the existing Government of the Soviets, the Church retains, in fullest measure, her freedom of independent action and initiative. But whereas the Kerensky régime maintained the Budget of Catholic Worship—that is to say, the conservation and enjoyment of such "temporalities" as the Church (as a Corporation) might possess—the Soviet has entirely suppressed all religious endowments whatsoever, and has practically placed an embargo upon the foundation of schools.

A duly authenticated collection of the official Documents and Acts of "The Socialist Government of Russia" has recently been published (July, 1918), in French, at the Geneva printing-press of the Working-men's Unions; and it is therefore possible fairly and accurately to determine the present legal *status* of Religious Bodies in that country. The Decree of the Commissioners of the People "On the Separation of the Church from the State and of the School from the Church" (originally promulgated in *The Bulletin of the Pro-*

visionary Government of Labourers and Peasants, January 23, 1918, No. XV.) runs as follows:

- I. The Church is separated from the State.
 - II. Within the limits of the Republic, it is forbidden to put forth any local laws of any kind which in any way restrain or limit the liberty of conscience, or which institute any favours or privileges whatsoever upon the bases of the beliefs or confessional opinions of the citizens.
 - III. Each citizen may practise any form of religion he pleases, no matter what; or none at all. All deprivations of rights, bound up with the exercise, or non-exercise, of any form of religion, are abolished.
- N.B.—Every indication of the confessional adherence, or non-adherence of citizens, is excluded from all Official Acts.
- IV. The function of the Institutions of State, and of the other Institutions of Public Right, is unaccompanied by any religious rite or ceremony.
 - V. The free performance of religious rites is guaranteed, provided that such rites are not disturbing to the Public Order, and are not concerned with attacks against the rights of the citizens of the Republic of the Soviets.
In all such cases, the local authorities have the right to take all measures that are indispensable for the maintenance of order and public security.
 - VI. No individual can escape from the performance of his civil duties on the pretext of his religious views.
Exceptions to this rule, providing for the replacing of one civil duty by another, are admitted, in each particular case, on the decision of the Tribunal of the People.
 - VII. The oath, or religious declaration, is abolished.
In unavoidable cases, a solemn promise only shall be given.
 - VIII. The Acts of the Civil-Estate are established solely by the civil power: notably by the sections concerned with the registration of marriages and births.
 - IX. The School is separated from the Church.
The teaching of religious dogmas is not admitted in any national or public educational establishment; nor, indeed, in a private institution where subjects of general instruction (*sic*) are wont to be taught.
Citizens may teach and study religion in a private manner (*de façon privée*).
 - X. All ecclesiastical and religious societies are submitted to the general legislation upon private societies and unions, and can enjoy no prerogative or subsidy whatsoever, either on the part of the State, or on the part of the local, autonomous, self-governing institutions of the State.

- XI. Recuperations by means of collections and taxes in favour of ecclesiastical and religious societies, as well as any measures of coercion or punishment on the part of such societies upon their members, are not admitted.
- XII. No ecclesiastical or religious society has the right to possess property. The societies aforesaid have not the rights of a juridic personage.
- XIII. All the possessions of ecclesiastical or religious societies at present existing are declared to be the patrimony of the People.
On special decision of the local or central Powers of the State, the edifices and objects specially appertaining to worship are remitted to the gratuitous disposition of the corresponding religious societies.

This Decree is signed by the following persons :—

The President of the Council of the Commissioners of the People :

W. Oulianoff [Lenine];

The Commissioners of the People : Podwoisky, Algassoff, Troutowsky, Schlikhter, Prochyan, Menjinsky, Schliaprikoff, Petrowsky;

The Secretary of the Council : Bontch-Brouïevitch.

Article XI of the Decree "On the Eight-Hours' Working-day, and the duration and re-settlement of the times of work" (Petrograd, October 29, 1917), provides some interesting information regarding the holidays to be observed in Republican Russia :

"In the table of holidays during which no work is permitted (§ 2, Art. 103, Statutes of Industrial Labour) are comprised all Sundays and the holidays following: January 1st, January 6th, February 27th, March 25th, May 1st, August 15th, September 14th, December 25th and 26th, Good Friday and Holy Saturday, Easter Monday and Tuesday, Ascension Day and Whit-Monday.

(i) Those who are not Christians may observe as holidays other days than the Sundays, in conformity with the laws of their religion. In addition, the remainder of the days signified above are compulsory holidays for such persons.

(ii) According to the wishes of the majority of the working-people in particular factories, establishments, etc., the holidays: January 1st and 6th, August 15th, September 14th, December 26th, Holy Saturday and Easter Monday, may be replaced by other free days."

The situation of the Catholic Church in Russia, as indicated in the foregoing documents, certainly cannot be described

as being a brilliantly ideal one, even upon paper ; still it must be remembered that the admirably precise provisions of M. Kerensky's Government, which specifically guarantee her complete autonomy, independence, and freedom of action, have not been otherwise tampered with or modified.

After all, "the proof of the pudding is in the eating"; and the Church has already contrived to win the good-will of the population (upon which so much depends), and to pluck at leisure the first-fruits of her new-found liberty.

Her first care has been to set about the creation and re-creation of an adequate number of bishoprics. The importance and necessity of this step will be manifest when we consider that, over and above seven dioceses in Russian Poland, there existed in the entire Empire, at the eve of the Revolution, only four bishoprics suffragan to the unwieldy Metropolitan See of Mohilef—extending, literally, from the Baltic to the Japanese Sea. The Holy Father has already nominated their bishops to six dioceses which had long been suppressed by the Tsars; and the Titular of the newly-revived Episcopal See of Minsk was consecrated the other day at Warsaw. The ancient diocese of Kanienietz, in Podolia, will be re-established as soon as the Austro-German occupation comes to an end; and active steps are at present being taken to found a much-needed bishopric in Siberia. And so the work of construction and of reconstruction continues to make headway. A Faculty of Catholic Theology, already numbering some 200 students, has been constituted at the new University of Warsaw; and it will be remembered that the Sovereign Pontiff has sent a Representative to that city, in the person of Mgr. Ratti.

In its issue of August 19, 1918, a Swiss Catholic daily newspaper, *La Liberté*, of Fribourg, prints some extracts from an article lately contributed to a Cracow review by the Abbé Stanislaus Trzciak, Professor of the Ecclesiastical Academy at Petrograd. Among other consoling matters, we learn that the tide of conversions is flowing full and free. Delivered from the fear of the persecuting *Tchin*, the Ruthenians are returning in crowds to the Faith of their fathers; and countless individuals of every class of Russian society—peasants, merchants, functionaries, aristocrats of the ancient *régime*—are seeking, day by day, admission into the One, True Church.

Small wonder that, despite the state of total destitution

brought upon them by the suppression of all endowments, the Catholic clergy are filled with confidence and high enthusiasm. *Corpus Christi* was publicly celebrated this year in Petrograd with the utmost splendour and magnificence; and thousands of people took part in a great procession of the Holy Sacrament which wended its way through the streets of the city.

As to the general attitude of the Maximalist Government towards the religious authorities, the Abbé remarks that it is consistently and irreproachably correct. Indeed, he notices a slight *nuance* of preferential treatment in favour of the Catholic Church in contradistinction to the old official religion, which is treated with studied coldness. We can easily believe that this is true; for the Maximalists instinctively show sympathy towards all who were oppressed under the Tsardom, and resentment to all who found favour in its eyes—moreover, rightly or wrongly, they suspect a great part of the schismatic clergy of holding reactionary opinions.

An ounce of illustration is worth a pound of theorizing; and we may safely leave these impressive facts to witness for themselves. The situation, at the moment of writing, is of exceeding hopefulness. But we must remember that the Revolution has by no means finished its course, that Russia is in a condition of chaos and of anarchy, and that Revolutionaries are kittle-cattle at the best. Whatever the future may bring forth, of this at least we are certain: that amid the downfall of dynasties and empires and the waxing and waning of republics and democracies, the Church will stand erect in lonely majesty, unchanging and unchanged; for she is builded upon the Rock, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against her. Wherefore, *Sursum corda!*

SAMUEL F. DARWIN FOX.

“THE SUMMIT”

MISS HETTY VANE was entertaining company in the parlour, such unbidden guests as come to us all when memory will not be denied. The low-ceiled wainscotted parlour faintly scented with pot-pourri, ghostly perfume of last year's roses, was full of laughing apparitions. It was Arethusa's birthday, and she had come back home again, as her sister had longed for her to do for so many years. Miss Hetty sat stiffly in her chair, her firm, capable hands clasped over the book of meditations which she had been reading, her eyes set in a stare. Arethusa sat on the chintz-covered sofa, her auburn curls shading the peach bloom of her cheeks. She played on the tinkling old piano, and the room vibrated with the music of her young voice. She looked back over her shoulder from the doorway leading to the dusky hall, a very phantom of delight. She pervaded every place, so poignantly fresh, so dominating were even these pale phantoms of memory, and every gesture was a barb that pierced her sister's heart.

She had waited so long;—some day she knew Arethusa would come back again, and they would spend the remainder of their lives together. Arethusa would be old,—could that be? Chastened and sobered no doubt, but never without charm;—could you picture her without charm? The phantom in the doorway lifted a rounded chin and smiled, that all-conquering smile of Arethusa's.

Miss Hetty saw again the rows of pig-tailed little school-girls, herself among the number, sitting at needlework, pricking laborious fingers, and counting the laggard hands of the clock, and then the sudden vision of Arethusa, like some lovely flower in the drab schoolroom. Arethusa, in a delicate silk gown, which ballooned over a crinoline, a fine needlework collar and a gold chain round her neck, and a cameo brooch,—indisputable insignia of womanhood. How enraptured she had been to see Arethusa! How that perfect being had dazzled the other little fledglings, as she dazzled other eyes outside when the little sister walked beside her to take tea out at a cakeshop;—unprecedented revelry! The spicy flavour

of Shrewsbury cakes was for ever to be associated in her memory with that splendid afternoon. She had taken back a large packet of them to the other little captives she remembered, who had clustered round her on her return, plying her with questions about Arethusa. Not one of them had such a sister—plain, ordinary misses theirs, indeed, to judge by their photographs, though Milly Jebb had dared to imply that Arethusa's chestnut hair was "Carroty." The white heat and fury of the loyal little sister! Her thoughts lingered a moment on that scene and then passed on in a relentless march, to that summer morning at home when, on waking, she found Arethusa's bed was empty, and a note pinned to the pin-cushion.

That was all! A dark cloud hid Arethusa's going and her name was forbidden to be mentioned. But in most hearts is a secret altar, a cherished idol. Hetty had loved her sister in an uncommon measure, and her love and hope stood the slow effacing pressure of years. She put no new idol on the altar, but kept it swept and garnished for Arethusa alone.

The whole shameful truth of Arethusa's flight was never told to her. She was too young to hear, her father had decreed, or to know of the whispers and surmises, and forever stranded in the shallows of life, she had no knowledge of the depths into which Arethusa had so gaily launched.

As years passed and the school-girl changed into a reserved young woman, Arethusa faded from the minds of those among whom she had lived, but not from Hetty's heart. She grew a little precise, hardening slowly into a creature of habit and rule, meticulous in detail, and that was why, mindful of Arethusa's birthday, she had given herself to retrospect.

You'll be coming back agen
To your father and your mother in the glen.

Imogen Ann was droning in the kitchen. Her reedy voice came through to Miss Hetty. She was too young to entertain such company as her mistress. It was dull in the kitchen, and dulness was grievous to the Imogen side of her character, which was derived from her father who was as the lilies of the field, but of an indoor species, indigenous to the tap-room of the *Black Bull*.

At another time Miss Hetty would have reproved her youthful housemaid for unseemliness, and Ann, who knew "her place"

as indicated to her by a mother toiling for ever in a cloudy atmosphere of soapsuds, where Duty shone as a pale star, would have been abashed.

But now she leaned through the window and looked down the gravel path, hemmed in with flowers whose bright hues seemed to glow more brilliantly as twilight encroached on the golden sunset hour. The little village street with its knots of gossips was away down the hill, and there was not much likelihood of any passer-by to divert her. Imogen Ann yawned, and then her eyes brightened with interest and she leaned forward. A figure stopped at the wicket, and with a hesitating hand lifted the latch, and dragging, as with limbs infinitely weary, sat down on the garden seat at the end of the lawn.

Imogen Ann looked long and steadily, then, with the inherent antagonism of the housen folk for the Ishmael—"The impidence of sich," she murmured, and forthwith presented herself at the parlour door. "Please'm, there's a tramp, and she's sittin' on your garden seat."

Miss Hetty looked up startled, the laughing apparitions of Arethusa vanished, and the room seemed empty and chill.

"Shall I drive 'er away?"

"No, no, I will speak to her myself."

Imogen Ann, disappointed, lingered while Miss Hetty took down her Charity box, and extracted sixpence. Then, after a long look at the jaded, hopeless figure by the gate, she took out another sixpence, and went sedately down the garden path, lifting her grey muslin skirt from contact with the gravel walk.

The vagrant watched her coming in tense silence. She seemed the epitome of all the respectable virtues, untouched by any frailty, yet unsanctified by any baptism of the deep, remedial waters of sorrow, and a sigh broke from the breast beneath the tattered gown.

"Are you ill, my good woman?" Miss Hetty's voice was as cold and clear as ice. She had come to a standstill some little distance away, and her grasp on her skirts tightened. Unconsciously she held herself aloof. Good woman, and charitable as she strove to be, she had never essayed to bridge the gulf between herself and such human wreckage. Her delicate mouth hardened, as she took notice of the wretched clothes, the broken boots, and the collapsed attitude of the woman. She was a blot on the fair peace of the garden—a

slur on womanhood, and Miss Hetty felt vaguely resentful. Something of the ravaged face she could see beneath the deplorable hat and the history written there was distasteful to the eyes of virtue—yet the vagrant's steadfast gaze disconcerted her.

She leaned forward and laid the two sixpences on the seat. Not for worlds could she have let her hand come in contact with the unclean.

"You need money for a night's lodging, perhaps. There is a house in the village where they take in"—her voice hesitated—"travellers. When you are rested you had better pass on."

She stood in silence awaiting a reply. The sweet incense of the garden breathed around them and twilight was falling like a benediction.

"I'll go now." The vagrant stumbled to her feet and passed through the gateway into the road.

Miss Hetty turned back to the house with a sigh of relief. Poor, wretched creature. Drink and wickedness, no doubt, had brought the woman to such a pass, sad and shocking that such things should be! She closed the door firmly as though she would put a further barrier between her and the unwelcome visitor. Then she went into the parlour and wrote in her neat little account-book "Charity, 1s." For so do we label our pitiful doles from that boundless deep, immeasurable as the love of God.

Yet all evening she was vaguely uneasy, haunted by the woman's figure which seemed advancing upon her down a long, dark road. But, when at last she went to bed in the pleasant room she had once shared with Arethusa, she shook off the sinister impression, and slept soundly and dreamlessly.

But the vagrant sat in a ditch with her head in her hands. She had not sought the house in the village where they accommodated travellers. Too well she knew such foul harbours for derelicts. She sat among the dew-wet grasses and weeds, and the cool night airs swept round her in a cleansing tide.

Was it weeks or months ago that something had come down to her in the darkness, where all that was essentially herself had since ceased to be, so long had she been only a hunger and a thirst, caged in a shuddering body, wandering through aimless days.

A sudden impulse, an unbidden memory of home, of the tree-shaded fragrant garden, the green hills once so dear. A longing to be clean, to sleep in fine linen sheets beneath the old roof. All the delicate filaments that weave life's finest fabric, had been torn from her long ago, but these concrete images brought something back to her from the past. She had turned from the London Park, where she had been crouching, almost at a run, and driven by a power outside herself, set out on the long journey home. As she drifted across the blossoming country-side, the foul miasma of years passed away. Her mind cleared, coherent thought and purpose were there once more; she knew what she wanted, how desperate was her need.

But when she came at last to the remembered place, and saw Hetty—a woman now, austere and unsullied, coming down the path, looking at her with the cold, blank eyes of a stranger, she knew she had come in vain. Not for the children of the night, the homes of decent folk; she had closed the door behind her when she stole away on such a July night, and it would never open again.

She had seen herself in Hetty's eyes. She covered her face from the dreadful picture and long shudders shook her from head to foot. Long she sat there and the pitiful night folded her round, and old voices of ruth and consolation whispered to her from the fields and woods.

When, as the dark skies began to show the first pale tinge of light, she lifted her face, it showed a strange beauty. She had shamed Hetty once—Hetty and all her kin. She could not offer them this final affront. Perhaps Hetty still cherished some memory of her, a little clean memory, with the shining aureole of youth about it. Let her keep it.

Arethusa had climbed to the summit. She laid her sacrifice at the feet of the All-Pitiful. Can we doubt that it was accepted—and rewarded?

Then she arose and faced the dawn.

DOROTHEA BIRCH.

NOTES ON FAMILIAR PRAYERS

X. THE "MEMORARE."

ALTHOUGH the *Memorare* has never met with the official and liturgical recognition, accorded to, let us say, the *Te Deum*, or the *Salve Regina*, it is nevertheless a prayer which many people know by heart and which is now almost invariably included in our manuals of devotion. Most commonly it appears with the heading "Prayer of St. Bernard," upon which attribution we shall have more to say. To our mediæval forefathers in this country, or even to those who lived in the days of the penal laws, the *Memorare* does not seem to have been familiar either in English or in Latin. I have sought for it in vain in the early editions of the *Primer*, the *Manual of Prayers*, and the *Garden of the Soul*. It probably came to this country—though here I speak hesitatingly—by way of France. It was at any rate for France alone that Pope Pius IX. on 25th July, 1846, first enriched this prayer with a 300 days' indulgence *toties quoties* and a plenary indulgence once a month. Before the end of the same year, however, *i.e.*, on December 11, the indulgence was extended to the whole of Christendom, and the prayer may be found incorporated in the thoroughly revised edition of the *Raccolta*, the twelfth, which was published in Rome in 1849.¹ It may be well to set down the Latin text as it stands in that official collection. I print beside it one of the only too numerous English translations. That here given is not chosen as the best, but as likely to be the most widely familiar, since it is now included in the Appendix to what in remote pre-War days was still correctly described as the "Penny" Catechism.

Memorare.

Memorare, O piissima Virgo
Maria, non esse auditum a sæculo
quemquam ad tua currentem præ-

Prayer of St. Bernard.

Remember, O most loving Virgin
Mary, that never was it known that
any one who fled to thy protection,

¹ The first edition of the *Raccolta di Orazioni e pie Opere*, &c., was printed in 1807. Besides editions and translations appearing elsewhere, new Roman editions were published in 1810, 1812, 1814, 1818, 1823, 1831, 1834, 1837 and 1841. The edition of 1849 was accompanied by a special Decree of approbation from the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences.

sidia, tua implorantem auxilia, tua petentem suffragia, esse derelictum. Ego, tali animatus confidentia, ad te, Virgo virginum, Mater, curro; ad te venio; coram te gemens peccator assisto. Noli, Mater Verbi, verba mea despicere, sed audi propitia et exaudi. Amen.

implored thy help, and sought thy intercession, was left forsaken. Filled, therefore, with confidence in thy goodness, I fly to thee, O Mother, Virgin of Virgins; to thee I come, before thee I stand a sorrowing sinner. Despise not my words, O Mother of the Word, but graciously hear and grant my prayer.

Let us note in passing that it would be a great boon if the publishers and ecclesiastical authorities of English-speaking countries could come to some agreement with a view to the adoption of an uniform translation of our more familiar formularies, whether prayers, hymns or psalms. Take, for example, the *Memorare* with which we are now concerned. I have made no particular search, but such diversities as the following force themselves upon one's notice. The translation just reproduced from the Appendix to the Catechism¹ begins "Remember, O most loving Virgin Mary, that never was it known," &c. The translation in the *Manual of Prayers for Congregational Use*, "Version prescribed by the Cardinal-Archbishop and Bishops of England"² and issued in 1886, opens thus: "Remember, O most loving Virgin Mary, that it is a thing unheard of that any one ever had recourse to thy protection," &c. The English translation of the *Raccolta*, made originally by Father Ambrose St. John, and officially approved in 1857, but published in many editions subsequently, runs "Remember, O most gracious Virgin Mary, that never was it known," &c. This version has apparently been adopted in the American *Raccolta* (Philadelphia, 1900) but not without variation, e.g., we have for the concluding words "in thy mercy hear and answer me" where Father St. John prints "in thy clemency hear and answer me," and where both the *Manual* and the Catechism give "graciously hear and grant my prayer." Other translations begin: "Remember O most holy Virgin Mary," or again "Remember, O most pious Virgin

¹ The edition in question is that published by Messrs. Burns and Oates.

² Cardinal Manning and the fourteen suffragans whose names are printed with his, formally approve this *Manual* and "order that wherever the prayers therein contained are used in public, the version given in this *Manual* be adhered to. We also desire that this authorized version be adopted in all books of devotion which may be published in future."

Mary." In these two last cases the rendering can hardly be called accurate, but for the most part there is no ground for complaint except the lack of uniformity.

Turning to the heading "Prayer of St. Bernard" which is prefixed both to the Catechism version and to that in the *Manual of Prayers*, I can only say that I know of no evidence to show that the *Memorare* was used in the twelfth century as a separate and independent formula of devotion, still less of any which would connect it directly with the great Abbot of Clairvaux. Undoubtedly the feeling expressed in it is in thorough harmony with the mind of St. Bernard, and the Abbé Vacandard has quoted from the sermons of that great orator two passages which are closely analogous in their general drift,¹ but the actual wording is after all quite different from that of our prayer. Moreover, the *Mater misericordie* theme was extremely familiar to the writers of that age, and I believe that a score of parallels of similar import might with very little trouble be collected from their pages. Deeply as one respects M. Vacandard's competence and his right to speak authoritatively in all questions affecting St. Bernard, it is not easy to accept his view that the attribution in our prayer books is based on such vague resemblances as these.

But while it is now generally admitted that the *Memorare* cannot in any proper sense claim St. Bernard for its author, it is at the same time held by many that the introduction of his name is not the result of a mere guess but that it is due to a confusion between the Saint of Clairvaux and another apostolic preacher of much later date, Claude Bernard, who was known to his contemporaries as the "Poor Priest." Claude Bernard, who was born in 1588 and died in 1641, devoted himself with extraordinary zeal and success to the work of succouring unfortunate prisoners and criminals condemned to death. His latest biographer,² the Commandeur de Broqua, who is also

¹ See Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Bernard*, Second Edition, Paris, 1897. He quotes, "Sileat misericordiam tuam, Virgo beata, si quis est qui invocatum te in necessitatibus suis sibi meminerit defuisse." *In Assumpt.* Serm. IV. n. 8 (Migne, P.L. clxxxiii. 428). Also: "Jam te, Mater misericordie, per ipsum sincerissimæ tuæ mentis affectum, tuis jacens provoluta pedibus Luna (i.e., Ecclesia) mediatricem sibi apud Solem justitiæ constitutam devotis supplicationibus interpellat." Serm. *Infra Octavam Assumpt.* n. 15 (Migne, P.L. clxxxiii. 438).

² Claude Bernard, dit "le Pauvre Prêtre," par Commandeur de Broqua, deuxième édition. Paris: Lethielleux, 1913.

the postulator of the cause of his Beatification, gives a wonderful account of the miracles of conversion he effected in dealing with the most hardened sinners. There seems to be no doubt that the instrument to which he invariably had recourse in difficult cases was the recitation of the *Memorare*. So completely was he identified with the prayer in popular tradition that of the eighteen engraved portraits of this holy priest which are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris a considerable number, and especially those which are of almost contemporary date, have this prayer engraved beneath the picture.¹ Such is the case, for example, with the portrait which M. de Broqua reproduces as the frontispiece to his volume, and we can learn from it that the text of the *Memorare* as taught by Père Bernard was in substance identical with that now in use.² It bears the simple heading ORAISON DU R. P. BERNARD A LA VIERGE. No argument is needed to prove how easily later editors may have misread this description and transformed it into an attribution to St. Bernard of Clairvaux. From other data supplied by M. de Broqua we also learn that the recommendation of the holy priest must have contributed immensely to popularize the prayer and to spread belief in its efficacy. During the years of his missionary activity it appears that he had more than 200,000 copies of the *Memorare* in various languages printed as leaflets, and these he distributed where he thought they would do good. We might not be greatly impressed by these numbers in the present day, but it must be remembered that the printing and circulation of leaflets in the seventeenth century was a very different matter from what it is now. One of the reasons which led Père Bernard to put so much faith in this formula of devotion was the fact that he himself had been miraculously cured by its use. Writing to Anne of Austria, the Queen of Louis XIII., who seems to have had a great regard for this saintly missionary, he on one occasion gave her the following account of the incident:

I was dangerously ill [he tells her] and so overcome by the fear of death that to obtain my recovery I had recourse to our Lady's intercession and for that end I recited the *Memorare*. Thereupon I instantaneously felt relief, but as I could not persuade

¹ De Broqua, *l.c.*, p. 126.

² The translation is decidedly free, but one can see that it corresponds with the same Latin text as that indulgenced by the Holy See, as printed above.

myself that God had worked a miracle in my favour I attributed the cure to some natural cause. I was speaking in this sense to a friend who came to congratulate me on my recovery, when I heard a knock at the door. I opened it, and found outside the venerable Brother Fiacre, a discalced Augustinian, whom at that time I only knew by sight. Seeing that I was very much out of humour and that I turned away from him without speaking, "Sir," he said, "pray forgive me if I have come at an inopportune moment, but I only wished to inquire how you were, for the Blessed Virgin appeared to me last night, telling me of your illness, and that she had cured you, and bade me come in her name to assure you of the fact." I was overwhelmed with confusion at the thought of my ingratitude in attributing to natural causes a cure which I owed entirely to the tender pity of the Mother of God. I at once besought her forgiveness, and at present I proclaim to all the world that since that moment I have never had another attack of the malady of which she has cured me and to which I was formerly very liable.¹

Whatever may be thought of the miraculous character of this episode, it is plain that Père Bernard himself had no doubts upon the subject. Not unnaturally he had recourse to the same remedy in all emergencies, and certainly some of the stories told of his dealings with impenitent criminals are wonderful in the extreme. On one occasion, it is stated, he was pleading for the soul of a malefactor who was actually being conducted to the scaffold, but who had hitherto resisted every appeal of the many priests who had tried to move him to repentance. Father Bernard alone would not despair. While the executioner was making his preparations and adjusting the halter, he climbed up the ladder beside the criminal and there embraced him in a final attempt to touch his heart. The man repulsed him with such violence that the priest fell from the ladder to the ground. But there, though seriously hurt, Père Bernard threw himself upon his knees and repeated aloud the *Memorare* in accents so poignant, that the miserable wretch burst into tears, begged permission to make his confession, and was thus reconciled with God.

From some of the stories his biographers tell it would appear that at times the holy priest's confidence in the efficacy of the *Memorare* was exhibited in ways which can only appear grotesque in such an age as ours. Having on one

¹ De Broqua, *l.c.* p. 124.

occasion to do with a man who, from having formerly been a monk, had fallen into such abandoned courses that he was sentenced to be broken on the wheel, Père Bernard exhausted every effort to persuade the poor reprobate to say with him at least one little prayer to our Blessed Lady. The criminal was obdurate and finally his would-be saviour broke out in despair: "Well, since you won't say it, you shall eat it" (*puisque tu ne veux pas la dire, tu la mangeras*), and he proceeded to stuff into his mouth one of the little printed copies of the *Memorare* which he always carried with him. Strange as it may appear, this extravagance had the effect of breaking down the prisoner's resolution. He promised to repeat the prayer and almost immediately thereupon, so at least we are assured, his heart was touched and he died with all the manifestations of the most sincere sorrow.¹

It need hardly be said that the responsibility for such a story as this must rest with the first narrator. It is repeated here not as a subject for imitation, but only to illustrate the degree in which Claude Bernard's influence was likely to popularize the use of this particular prayer. The *Memorare* also played a part in the act of charity and devotion which finally cost him his life. Here again it was the case of a criminal sentenced to the inconceivably barbarous punishment of being broken alive on the wheel. Overcoming, when all other efforts had failed, the obduracy of the poor sufferer, Père Bernard induced the concourse of spectators to join him in saying the *Memorare* aloud. So intense was the contrition which the criminal then experienced that he begged the executioner, we are told, to prolong the terrible sufferings which he was enduring in having his limbs broken one by one, in order that he might have something more to offer to God in expiation of his past misdeeds.² When all at last was over, the good priest went off to announce the happy tidings of this edifying death to other prisoners who lay in the dungeons and condemned cells awaiting their own turn. The day was cold, and in the fervour of his efforts to awaken the contrition of the sufferer, Père Bernard had overheated himself. In the damp underground vaults of the prison he caught a chill from which he never recovered. On his death-bed his last request was that the crucifix and a copy of the *Memorare*

¹ De Broqua, *l.c.*, pp. 120 ff.

² *Ibid.*, *l.c.*, p. 202.

might be given him that he might press them to his lips and to his heart as the principal instruments of the work by which he had tried to serve his Master.

Commandeur de Broqua seems to incline to the belief that Père Bernard was the actual author of the *Memorare*. This, however, is inconsistent with the data which he himself supplies. If Claude learnt the *Memorare* from his father there could hardly be better evidence that he (the son) had not composed it.¹ Moreover the prayer was certainly well known to St. Francis of Sales, who was twenty-one years older than Père Bernard, and died nineteen years before him. No doubt it is highly probable that a very large measure of the popularity of the *Memorare*, especially in France, was and is due to the "Poor Priest's" propaganda. That he was not, however, the author of the prayer itself was some years ago overwhelmingly made clear by the researches of Dr. Nikolaus Paulus, who published a short note on the subject in the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* for July, 1902. The most interesting detail which Dr. Paulus has brought to light is the fact that the *Memorare*, though it is to be found in manuscripts and printed books from the last quarter of the fifteenth century onwards, does not appear as a separate and independent formula, but only as a section of a longer prayer to our Lady, beginning *Ad sanctitatis tuæ pedes, dulcissima Virgo Maria*. At what date the excerpt was made, and then achieved independent popularity, does not appear. There seems at present no conclusive evidence to show that the *Memorare*, just as we know it, was in use much before the end of the sixteenth century (in the time of Claude Bernard or his father), but a rubric which is cited by Dr. Paulus from a *Hortulus Animæ* printed by J. Wellinger at Strassburg in 1503 seems at least to indicate the possibility of further discoveries. Speaking of the sick and dying and the means of providing them with spiritual help the compiler suggests a list of readings appropriate for the purpose. These are "the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the *Stabat Mater*, the *Legenda Sanctorum*, the *Memorare*, the *Ad sanctitatis tuæ pedes*, the seven

¹ From a logical point of view the following sentence of de Broqua (p. 125) is very curious: "Il n'y a pas de certitude absolue qui puisse faire assigner au P. Bernard la paternité de cette oraison, si repandue aujourd'hui; mais il est évident qu'elle était pour lui une tradition de famille, car il la tenait de son père qui attesta souvent les effets merveilleux de cette invocation."

Penitential Psalms and other prayers which induce to devotion." Obviously this seems to recognize the *Ad sanctitatis tuæ pedes* and the *Memorare* as separate formulæ, though we know that the latter was merely a part of the former, but, as Dr. Paulus very wisely remarks, we cannot assume that this *Memorare* really designates what we understand by the *Memorare*. It is conceivable that quite another prayer is meant, for example one addressed to our Lady beneath the cross and beginning *Memento, obsecro, dulcissima Mater*. I had hoped to undertake some examination of the fairly rich collection of devotional *incunabula* which is to be found among the treasures of the British Museum, with a view to clearing up some of these problems, but the wise precautions which have been taken at the Museum to prevent damage being done by air-raids renders it impossible at present to have access to several printed volumes and manuscripts necessary for the purpose. So I am perforce content to allow the matter to stand over for future discussion. Meanwhile it seems well to reproduce in Latin from the *Antidotarius Animæ* of Nicholas de Saliceto, the earlier portion of the prayer *Ad sanctitatis tuæ pedes*, with the view of showing how the *Memorare* stands imbedded in the substance of the older document. The earliest edition of this oft-reprinted work which I have been able personally to consult is that of Paris, 1518, but I have no reason to believe that the text substantially differs from that of the *incunabula* published at Strassburg and elsewhere in 1489, 1491, 1493, and other years.

Ad sanctitatis tuæ pedes, dulcissima Virgo Maria, corpore prostratus et corde, supplex oro ut aliquid a te rogare me doceas, quod te audire et Filium exaudire delectet. Indignus sum gratia et cunctis miserationibus tuis minor, peccatis meis obstantibus. A te, Sanctissima, audiri et a Filio tuo benignissimo exaudiri non mereor. Noli tamen ad te clamantem et vitam emendare cupientem pia repellere quæ manum gratiæ porrigere soles ad te suspiranti. *Memorare, piissima, non esse auditum a sæculo, quemquam ad tua currentem præsidia aut tua potentem suffragia a te derelictum. Tali animatus confidentia ad te, Virgo Maria, confugio, ad te curro, ad te venio, coram te gemens et tremens assisto. Noli, Virgo Immaculata, a me peccatore faciem tuam abscondere, sed ad me clementer respice. [Noli, Mater Verbi, mea despicere verba, sed audi propitia et exaudi oris mei verba.]* Noli mater omnium ab omni benignitate tua me excludere sed benigne fac mecum propter nomen tuum sanctum.

Noli mater gratiæ Filii tui gratiam mihi denegare, sed gratifica me gratiæ illi quem tu, gratia plena, peperisti. . . .

The sentence in square brackets is not apparently to be found in the *Antidotarius*, but I have copied it from a later version of the *Ad sanctitatis tuæ pedes* which is contained in certain editions of the *Precationum piarum Enchiridion*, a prayer book compiled about 1570 by Simon Verepæus. In this last work, the whole formula, as Dr. Paulus has pointed out, is ascribed to St. Chrysostom on the authority of a Strassburg edition of the *Hortulus Animæ*. But this attribution is probably just as untrustworthy as that of Père Suffren and others who assign the *Memorare* to St. Augustine. After the portion of the prayer just printed follow seven or eight other clauses, each beginning with *noli*—*noli stella maris, noli porta cæli, noli regina gloriæ, &c.*—and this series in turn is followed by a number of apostrophes; *e.g.*, *salva me salvatrix, redime me redemptrix, &c.*, until the prayer ends with an appeal for our Lady's help at the hour of death—in *hora exitus mei clemens mihi adesse digneris, &c.*

It must be confessed that there is a good deal of tautology—a repetition of ideas, at any rate, if not of words—in the original *Ad sanctitatis tuæ pedes*. Whoever in the sixteenth century may have been responsible for the abridgment has acted wisely and chosen well. It seems impossible at present to say more than that.

Only one other curious point connected with the subject of this article seems to call for a word of notice, but it may be dealt with very briefly. In the same year, 1846, in which the *Memorare* was indulgenced by Pius IX., a precisely similar indulgence was accorded to another formula of devotion, *Ave augustissima*, which after a few independent words of introduction closely echoes the phraseology of the *Memorare*.

I have slightly modified the translation in Father Ambrose St. John's edition of the *Raccolta*—

Ave, augustissima, Regina pacis, sanctissima Mater Dei, per Sacratissimum Cor Jesu, Filii tui, Principis Pacis, fac ut quiescat ira ipsius et regnet super nos in pace. Memorare, O piissima Virgo Maria, non esse auditum a sæculo quemquam tua petentem suffragia esse dere-

Hail, thou that art most venerable, Queen of Peace, most holy Mother of God, through the Sacred Heart of Jesus, thy Son, the Prince of Peace, procure for us the cessation of His anger, that so He may reign over us in peace. Remember, O most gracious Virgin Mary, that

lictum. Ego tali animatus confidentia ad te venio. Noli, Mater Verbi, verba mea despiciere sed audi propitia et exaudi. O clemens, O pia, O dulcis Virgo Maria.

never was it known that anyone who sought thy intercession was left forsaken. Inspired with this confidence, I come unto thee. Despise not my petitions, O Mother of the Word; but graciously hear and grant my prayer. O merciful, O kind, O sweet Virgin Mary.

As to the date of this variation upon the *Memorare* I have little or no information to offer. It is, however, stated in certain manuals of devotion that the *Ave augustissima* is a copy of an inscription upon a bronze plate inserted in the back of the statue of our Lady which stands in the Liberian Basilica, better known as the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, at Rome.¹ It is curious that during this period of world strife, more has not been heard of this beautiful prayer for peace, which would seem to be of relatively ancient date and has already been richly indulged.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ The *Libellus Precum* of 1844, printed in Richmond, Yorkshire, gives the *Memorare* but in a slightly different form from that indulged two years later. The Liverpool edition of 1863 gives both the *Ave Augustissima* and the *Memorare* in their present form, explaining that the former was inscribed on the statue of our Lady, as stated above.

MAMMON AND MARS

NO dictionary of mythology will be found to assert that any relationship exists between these two deities: they belong, in fact, to two wholly different theogonies: but, considering the connection between the vices they symbolize, they may, we think, be aptly described as father and son. The worship of Mammon necessitates the cult of Mars. Unbridled competition for wealth and the sources of wealth has always been one chief cause of war between nations: it may, in fact, be said to be the one persistent cause. There have been in the past other sources of conflict,—dynastic ambitions, religious fanaticism, racial rivalries—but these are no longer as prolific as they were. The economic source alone remains as fruitful as ever. Love of money, the Apostle assures us, is the root of all evil. If we are ever, in despair otherwise for civilization, to bring war to an end, we must look to its chief source. We must put Mammon under restraint the better to restrain Mars.

The difficulty is, of course, to determine what degree of regulation should be imposed upon Mammon. We cannot aim at eradicating cupidity for, though it produces evil, it produces much good as well. Love of money is the source of much of the world's enterprise; it is one main object of the human virtue of hope, so necessary to stimulate man's energies. Without it, life would be in danger of stagnating. And it grows naturally out of the deepest of human instincts, the instinct of self-preservation. For the desire of wealth, except in the diseased mind of the miser, is the desire of what wealth commands—subsistence, pleasure, leisure, friends, power, opportunity—all natural goods assisting self-development and lawful objects of desire. They become evil only when made the main object of existence and pursued without limit. So covetousness, like all human passions, must be ruled and schooled and brought under discipline. If wealth is desired and pursued irrespective of man's final end, or of the rights of others; if it is sought through a cowardly shrinking from discomfort or for the mere sake of possession, then indeed it becomes the source of every sort of evil. The natural instinct

has lost the checks which reason itself would apply to it and which God has expressly ordained. The individual, out of harmony with himself, becomes a source of disorder to his surroundings.

And so to the door of Mammon thus worshipped may be laid the veiled civil war which nowadays exists in every great community between Capital and Labour: it is a potent solvent of national unity and essentially anti-social. We have only to recall the fearful inhumanity practised on the working classes during the Industrial Revolution,¹—and we can recall it the more easily that there are many traces of it left;—we have only to remember the slavery, pillage and murder that have marked the relations of "strong" nations towards the weak, to realize to what depths of wickedness this uncurbed love of money can reduce human beings. "*Auri sacra fames*"—the accursed hunger for gold—nothing in man more needs the restraints of religion and morality than this deep-seated and powerful passion.²

And, as religion and morality are not wholly effective checks in all cases, and in some are not effective at all, it needs as well the restraints of human law. Society has to protect itself against the swindler and the thief whose desire of money leads them to take it unjustly from others: it should also protect itself, in peace no less than in war, against those more legal forms of injustice—sweating, "profiteering," Stock-Exchange gambling. Unregulated appetite for money has been at the root of most social disorders during the war. The most general cause of strikes is the feeling prevalent amongst the workers that employers are absorbing more than their fair share of profits. And how much unnecessary misery has been caused by unjustly high prices? Keen-eyed observers are, doubtless, taking stock of the many instances which have

¹ Summarily sketched nearly a year ago in *THE MONTH* in an article "The Two Nations," which tended to show how easily Mammon may be the father of civil war.

² The annals of every modern State are stained with hideous crimes against the rights of inferior races. Even nowadays our African colonies are regarded by legislators as estates to be farmed for the benefits of the home population. "The land belongs to the Empire, does it not?" said Major Hunt, in a debate upon the Colonial Vote, Aug. 3, 1916. "And the people who live on it [not, who own it] grow nuts, do they not?" Therefore, he goes on to argue that those mere natives must dispose of their produce, not to their own best advantage but as best suits their "owners." It is plain that the sentiments which produced the American revolution still echo in the House of Commons!

occurred since August, 1914, of firms finding in war conditions and needs a means of unduly enhancing their profits. In so far as such action was deliberate and unnecessary, the record will prove a sad commentary upon our boasted patriotism. That is a virtue, indeed, at which Mammon laughs: his votaries would as readily sell their country as they do sell their countrymen.

We have not the monopoly of the class. All the Allied countries and all the nations opposed to them have suffered from the profiteer. Chance puts into our hands at the moment extracts from the report presented to the American Senate on June 29 by the Federal Trade Commission appointed to examine into the constant rise in prices in the States. "Inordinate greed and barefaced fraud" are mentioned amongst the main causes. The meat packers and the millers were the chief offenders. Manipulation of the market by the five great meat-packing firms "embrace every device that is useful to them without regard to law." As for the millers, who evaded the prices legally fixed, the U.S. Government last July took the simple step of confiscating their profits whenever they were over the appointed maximum.¹

Moreover, so terribly does avarice pervert the conscience that trading with the enemy can only be kept down by incessant watchfulness. We can hardly doubt that the scandal that occurred in the Boer War of a British armament firm supplying the enemy with weapons would be repeated to-day did occasion offer. There is literally no baseness from which those possessed with the lust of excessive gain will shrink to gratify their passion. They will even expose the soldier to suffering and death by supplying faulty equipment, so that they may profit by the fraud. The phenomenon is as widespread as humanity itself: it appears amongst all the greater nations and amongst traders of every degree.²

We recall these characteristics of Mammon worship in order to point out that a spirit so productive of strife and injustice within the State can hardly be expected to promote peace between nations. In other matters, in art, science, literature,

¹ As an offset to this we may mention the report that Mr. Ford intends to hand over *all* his profits, which run into the millions, to the U. S. Treasury, disdaining to grow richer on his country's sacrifices.

² In such books as Perris' *The War-Traders*, past anti-patriotic infamies of the great armament firms are pilloried for all to see.

exploration, there is rivalry amongst the various races, but a rivalry which only leads to a friendly competition: each can enjoy or employ the creations and discoveries of the others. But rivalry in commerce, competition in money-making, awakens an instant and selfish belligerency, and, unless it is counteracted in some way by higher considerations, it inevitably inspires a policy of fraud or force in the individual interest which has often resulted in war.

In the individual interest. We may note here a common fallacy, viz., that the welfare of the State is necessarily connected with the commercial success of certain of its members. The fallacy was prevalent in the old bad days when, under the godless economic theories of the Manchester School, the individual was encouraged to augment his own fortune, without stint or regard for his workers, by the doctrine that he was thus adding to the prosperity of the State. We know better now. We know that it is possible for the aggregate wealth of the country to be enormous whilst large masses of its population are sunk in the direst poverty. A nation which is rich in this sense is not really prosperous, and its government has failed in one of its chief functions. But the notion is still widely held. It is assumed that, because the trader, in pursuing his own fortunes, has often in the past added to the extent of the Empire, therefore commercial enterprise should always have the backing of the State, and that the State itself should, like ancient Carthage and mediæval Venice, concern itself primarily with trade. The State should, no doubt, aim at securing justice for the merchant as well as for other citizens, but it is not to be called upon to support undertakings which merely result in making rich men richer or to throw the weight of its influence into commercial bargainings. In a bureaucracy like ours it is inevitable that what are euphemistically called "financial interests" should have a preponderating voice in political decisions. The history of the Boer War which, undertaken largely in defence of financiers, not all of them, even, British, only resulted in a drastic limitation of the Home Government's influence over South Africa, is a striking commentary on the process.

The sole grounds for Government interfering in the commercial transactions of its citizens lie in the securing of justice, not only for those engaged in trade, but also, and just as keenly, for those with whom they deal. Mammon, which

has to be regulated to avoid disturbance in national life, needs just as much watching if justice is to govern international relations. Hitherto national self-interest has too often thrust justice aside, and we must face this fact in our projects of reconstruction. Is the new world to continue to hold the fundamental principle of the old, viz., that nations can only prosper at the expense of their neighbours? And is this policy to find expression as it has done in the struggle for the control of foreign markets, raw materials, exclusive spheres of influence? If so, then farewell to all prospects of future peace! It is hardly too much to say that all past wars have had some such object although it may not always have been the object or ostensible one. At any rate, the frequent menace of war in the years preceding its actual outbreak turned mainly upon matters of trade. And the German pretext for this war was the alleged fact that she was being "stifled": that her rivals would not give her a fair share in the good things going in the world. She had no proper seaboard, no room for her growing population, no command of raw materials sufficient for her needs. Throughout all her plea may be seen the false ideal of a completely self-contained and independent State—that practical denial of human brotherhood which results from the excessive cult of "nationality." That, as we shall see, is the great danger ahead of present projects for the world's peace. If the ideas of economic and national domination,—the one as a means to the other—are not utterly overthrown, along with the State which most effectively combined them, there will be no chance of a permanent change in international relations.

We must begin here at home. The militarist, as we well know, is still active amongst us—the man who has nothing better to propose than a return to the old abomination of the armed truce and, in the face of all experience, looks to blind competition in armaments for peace and security. With him, war between nations is inevitable, and men, who will not tolerate anarchy within their own borders, must needs put up with it in the world of States. He therefore tries to think well of war and to attach to it all sorts of noble qualities, instead of recognizing it as a last desperate remedy, feeble, wasteful and uncertain at that, for a desperate disease—the unchecked triumph of international injustice. With this philosophy there is no arguing, for it flies in the face of reason

and history alike, ignores the power of Christianity and the providence of God and reduces man to the level of the irresponsible beasts, the sport of their own savage instincts. We can only hope that the bulk of the nation—those especially who have suffered most and have most to suffer from war—will be able to keep to the ways of sanity, in spite of the shrieks of the Jingo journalist, the "hidden hand" of the war-trader and the whole crew of immoralists who think that patriotism consists in hating and vilifying other nations.

But there are others who would repudiate this godless cult of war and who see the folly involved in vast and growing preparations for mutual slaughter, who yet would deny that there can be community of interest between all the nations of the globe and are militarists, perhaps unconsciously, in the economic sphere. They think greatness consists in extent of trade and territory, and in the degree in which independence of the help and co-operation of other States can be attained. Their ideal is a State so strong that it can defend itself against all enemies, so wide-spread that it can accommodate all its citizens, so rich that it is wholly self-sufficing. They aim, in other words, at a greatness which is incompatible with justice to other peoples, for clearly what they seek is out of reach of more than one or two. It is not for nations, any more than for individuals, to live for themselves and by themselves. Absolute and independent sovereignties are impossible and would be undesirable though they were not. Nations as well as individuals hold their lands in trust: such tenure thereof as would make it hard or impossible for other nations to prosper is unjustifiable usurpation. Economic militarism is a form of national selfishness which, besides being in the long run bad for the nation that practises it, is certain to turn to actual fighting. Accordingly, those who are anxious for the peace of the world necessarily view with distrust the measures which are frequently advocated of extending the present struggle, after the military contest is over, into the world of commerce. Anything in which Mammon has so potent a voice must needs be suspect.

Let us make our position clear. Looking on this awful conflict as a war of pure aggression on the part of Germany's rulers, and as conducted by those rulers with a brutal disregard of justice and humanity, we consider them as criminals, far more deserving than ordinary thieves and murderers

of the penalties of their crimes. Of the moral right possessed by the Allies to punish them, we have not the smallest doubt. Of the justice of involving their peoples indiscriminately in that punishment we have the gravest. It still remains true that one cannot indict a nation. It may be, as our hate-mongers constantly assert, that the typical German is of a coarser moral fibre than the members of other states. That is a matter of evidence, and the typical German still remains to be defined. But unless it can be shown that the Teutonic peoples as a whole were *not* persuaded that they were engaged in lawful and necessary self-defence, there is no justice and no common sense in inflicting on them any other penalty than is involved in the disgrace of their military defeat and in the measures which must be taken to prevent the revival of their "Prussianism." Once awakened to the truth, often indeed asserted by our responsible leaders, that we are not bent on destroying these enemy peoples but only on teaching them to behave as decent members of the family of nations, there will be some chance of their becoming converted, and ridding themselves of the poisonous system that has brought them to their tragic plight. The world will be a hard place for Germans to live in, whether they travel or stay at home, for many generations; but it should not be made an impossible place for them to live in. If punishment is to be, as it ought, deterrent as well as vindictive, it must be recognized as just by those subjected to it. The economic strangulation of the German people, which is threatened in the Paris resolutions and in many other less official programmes, is not just, and even if it were is thoroughly inexpedient. Mammon in this case is a blind and evil counsellor. The shibboleths of the proposed "trade-war"—the withholding of raw materials, the boycotting of German goods, the closing of colonial markets, the pledge of the seamen, punitive tariffs, and the rest—bode ill for our future peace and harmony. Happily we have two strong securities against the passing of such disastrous legislation,—“Labour” is solidly against the economic war, and so is America. At the date of writing the Allied Labour Congress has reiterated its protest,¹ whilst President Wilson, in his reply to the Pope’s Peace Note, has long ago stated the

¹ See section iv. of the *Memorandum on War Aims*, “Economic Relations,” shortly expressed by the American Labour Party as “No political or economic restrictions meant to benefit some nations and to cripple or embarrass others.”

American view in a striking passage, as true as it is eloquent.

No peace can rest securely upon political or economic restrictions meant to benefit some nations and cripple or embarrass others, upon vindictive action of any sort, or any kind of revenge or deliberate injury . . . Punitive damages, the dismemberment of Empires, the establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues we deem inexpedient and in the end worse than futile, no proper basis for a peace of any kind, least of all for an enduring peace. That must be based upon justice and fairness and the common rights of mankind.

America has entered this war for the sake of peace and, having joined, is pursuing that end with characteristic vigour. The colossal extent both of her performance and of her preparation is a sign of the force of her determination: she is not likely, when the time to clean up and establish comes, to allow the perpetuation of any elements in the settlement which would endanger the peace she is aiming at. To say the least, her citizens of German extraction, who are aiding whole-heartedly in the project for removing the Prussian incubus from their former country, will not tolerate any measure intended to prevent its recovery after the operation has been successfully performed. With the forces of Allied Labour and the United States thus combined against it, it is to be hoped that this pet project of Mammon, a vindictive trade-war, will never come to birth.

Into the tangled and wider subject of Protectionism, this is not the place to enter. It is not essentially a moral question. It must be granted that any State has the right, in order to promote the general welfare, to place a tariff upon imports and even to extend preference to the products of its own scattered constituents. But since, as we have seen, almost all international disputes now turn upon matters of markets, clearly the less artificial obstruction to trade there is, especially in the way of discrimination, the better for the peace of the world. It is not open commercial competition but arbitrary restraint on competition that produces friction. Tariffs may in some cases be a necessity, but from the point of view of peace they are always regrettable. The immediate commercial loss due to their removal would be more than made up by the gain to the world's harmony. Commercial rivalry is a struggle between individuals and does not necessarily affect the welfare of the community: what the producer loses,

may be a benefit to the consumer. But the imposition of a tariff is an act of State and belongs, therefore, to the international sphere. If only partial in its application it is equivalently an act of war against those to whom it is applied.

These are general considerations which do not invalidate the justice and even the expediency of establishing tariffs in particular cases.¹ And if, as seems to have been German policy, trade penetration is fostered by Government for other than commercial ends, then it may rightly be met by defensive measures. It is part of the crime of that nation that she has habitually and formally associated Mammon and Mars, and really waged war in peace time. But apart from proved instances of these political objects in commerce, there is nothing sinister in the trade penetration of one country by another: on the contrary it makes for the peace and security of the world. And this country, as much as any other, has constantly practised it to the best of its opportunities.

As before implied, one's views on this subject will naturally vary according as one contemplates the continuance of the old international anarchy or the extension of law to the relations between States. In the latter event, the unfair methods which might be developed through unrestricted commercial competition would have to be provided against by international agreements. There would be no need, then, for the exclusive possession of coaling-stations, and countries which have no natural outlet to the sea, like Serbia or Southern Russia, would not suffer, because they would be free to use those of their neighbours. Germany complains that her access to the sea is blocked by Holland, and that her river, the Rhine, ceases to be hers just when it becomes most useful for navigation. The complaint would have no meaning but for the fact that Holland places restrictions on her use of it. Belgium is geographically in like case. Her chief river, the Scheldt, becomes Dutch as it enters the sea, but, as she has obtained from Holland full rights to the use of the estuary, that fact causes no inconvenience. One can easily see that, if every people were to claim as "natural frontiers," those which most conduce to its safety and prosperity, the world would never know peace, for geographically those claims could never all be satisfied. But allow practically free transit for goods

¹ For instance, to prevent "dumping" or the flooding the market with goods at less than cost price in order to kill competition and then demand monopolistic price, or, again, the introduction of "sweated" goods.

across frontiers, and no one has cause to complain. The main cause of war has disappeared.

This ideal will seem wild and absurd to all who think that the nation should be, as much as possible, a self-contained economic whole. And that is *their* ideal, because they cannot imagine a world arranged otherwise than at present when there is no operative international law and each nation had to do its best to provide for its own security. Consequently the one test by which we can estimate the sincerity of those statesmen who advocate a League of Free Nations to prevent war is the willingness they display to reconsider the old ideal and to recognize that, unless it is abandoned to a large extent, they will never succeed in their aim. For this reason we must rank amongst the opponents of that project all those who would prosecute in the interests of national individualism a definite trade-war aimed at denying to our present foes, even when beaten and repentant, the means of commercial recuperation, and especially those who advocate a policy offensive to friend and foe alike, viz., the plausible plan of making the Commonwealth by various devices economically self-contained. This policy finds its most definite expression in an organization called the Empire Resources Development Committee. In so far as they are envisaging the continuance of that international anarchy which we are fighting to overthrow, they are no doubt justified in their project. A State which contains in itself all that is necessary for the maintenance of its strength would certainly be more secure in a warring world.¹ But the means it is adopting for its security is also the main cause of its danger. Its selfish exclusiveness must necessarily breed a host of enemies eager for its downfall. If the world is to have peace it must learn that nationalism and internationalism are not contradictory concepts. Just as the individual finds his full development in society, so, it may well be, the nation, freed through international alliances from the constant menace of aggression, will be able to realize itself and make its particular contribution to the universal stock in a manner and degree hitherto out of its reach. But it must first depose Mammon from its throne and put Justice there instead—that "Justice which exalteth the nation, whereas sin maketh the people wretched."

J. KEATING.

¹ That, we may remark in passing, is Dr. Naumann's object in his "Mittel-Europa" plan, which is considered so typically Hunnish.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE TIMES ON MORAL TEACHING.

THE Educational Supplement to *The Times* for Sept. 12 had an article on "Crimes and Moral Teaching" which—inasmuch as these Supplements aim at instructing public opinion with special reference to the educational problems now before the country, and are understood to emanate, at all events as far as their leading articles are concerned, from writers of repute and responsibility—is of a nature to deserve attention and to excite surprise. The writer of this particular article starts from a remark made on a recent occasion by a magistrate, who judged that "the increase of juvenile crime which has been so much in evidence lately, was caused by the lack of moral teaching in the schools." On this the writer in question maintains in defence of the schools that "the most essential points of morality cannot be directly taught at all, and in day schools there is little time or opportunity for the indirect teaching of them." How, he asks, are morals to be taught in our elementary schools? "They are not taught directly in our public schools; but there the moral training is, or is supposed to be, acquired indirectly through the spirit of the school, through games, through the continual influence of the house master, through the effect of the boys upon each other. The moral influence, in fact, is really a home influence; and in secondary day schools, as every master would confess, it is the home influence that counts, not the moral education of the school."

After thus justifying the schools, especially the day schools, for failing in what most people would regard as their primary work—and readers of such books as the *Loom of Youth*, especially if they test them by cross-examining their own sons brought up elsewhere on the same system, may well feel that these representative boarding schools need to take cover under the same defence—he goes on to expound for us the kind of home-influence which he considers to be the only school of moral training on which the English parents of the present and coming period can rely for the betterment of their children. We can agree with him that in the absence of so many of the fathers called away to the front, and often of their mothers too now engaged all day long on munitions or other public work, the increase of juvenile crime

(which is again in reality not usually animated by criminal motive, but by uncontrolled boyish one-sidedness) is largely to be accounted for. Not, however, wholly, as the writer himself allows, for he admits that a large mass of the parents are unsatisfactory in their methods of moral training, and we may be permitted to doubt if his proposed means of improving them will have much effect on its character. Certainly he does not suggest any further means of improving it than that the parents should be given "more leisure and energy, and well-being of their own enough to give it."

To return to the question of what schools can do for the moral training of their pupils, this writer refers in one place to the well-known story—or rather legend as we imagine it to be—of Keate, the famous head-master of Eton. "He would read a text from the Bible and then add his own comment—Blessed are the pure in heart. Now mind you're pure in heart, or I'll flog you." That, presumes our writer, "is not how the magistrate (whose remark had suggested the text for his article) would have morality taught, but if not how would he have it taught?" We do not know what answer the magistrate would give to this challenge, but an answer much to the point which he might give is this. It is too much the custom of schoolmasters in this country to treat the question of the moral training of their scholars *à la* Keate. Boys are tempted, as one knows, to contract when they reach the age of puberty sinful habits which if they are allowed to grow are hard for them to overcome, but which if not overcome are liable to dominate them, and be the source of much evil to themselves, and spread to others who become their associates or victims. It is the practice in many of the public schools, which cater for boarders or day-pupils, to come down heavily by floggings or expulsion on offenders of this sort when they happen to be found out, but otherwise to stand helpless in the presence of the evil, conscious of its existence and entertaining wild ideas which are at times grossly exaggerated, at other times grossly inadequate, as to the extent of its spread. They seem to be quite unaware of what a boy's nature is, of how useless it is to think that he can be reformed or improved by purely external methods such as punishments which must needs cease to have the little effectiveness there is in them, when the time for their enforced discontinuance and the graver insistency of temptations comes with the boy's transference from the discipline of the schoolroom to the liberty and licence of the big world outside. They seem to be unaware of a boy's need of guidance and sympathy in the struggle with his concupiscences and of how often he will welcome it when offered by some adult friend who can inspire him with confidence and

sustain his weakness in the hour of trial, of how from such persons he will readily accept both direct and indirect instruction and counsels which may be the saving of his moral and religious life, and may be given, *pace* the *Times* writer, without any undue disturbance, indeed greatly to the profit, of the curriculum of secular instruction. What is called school spirit is valuable for moral ends when added as a supplement to this system of interior government and guidance, but is useless as a mere substitute for it.

We have lamented the absence of these methods among so many of our teachers, among whom the writer we are criticizing is evidently one. But, thank God, there are many among them who have a more discerning conception of their function and its possibilities, and these are doing solid work in the good cause, though their merits in this respect are seldom awarded their true value in the appointment to school posts, so far as this is dependent on public and official bodies.

And here we are led on to claim for Catholic teachers in Catholic schools a marked superiority over other teachers and schools, in regard to this question of giving moral, and religious, teaching and training, direct and indirect, to their young charges. So far as the weaknesses inherent in young characters are concerned, Catholic teachers have to deal with pupils of the same sort as their fellow-teachers in non-Catholic schools. Great, however, is the difference between the two classes of pupils which has resulted from the difference of moral and religious influences that have been brought to bear upon them already in their pre-school life and their present home life; that is to say, through the persevering care that has been taken of the Catholic children by their parents, early teachers, and clergy from infancy upwards and has had the effect of cherishing and conserving in them a genuine spirit and love of piety, a fullness of faith in the existence of God as the judge to whom they are responsible for their conduct and whom they can rely upon as their friend, in the abiding sense of whose presence in their midst they have learnt to live, sustained, too, by the daily practice of prayer and constant frequentation of the Sacraments. With youths thus prepared and disposed, and with the same spiritual instruments in their own hands, in regular intercourse, too, with the clergy to whom they and their pupils alike look up as familiar friends and fathers, Catholic teachers have no difficulty in giving religious instruction to willing ears, no difficulty in attracting the confidence of their pupils, and thus strengthening and arming them to fight their moral and spiritual battles, and to cultivate and pursue high aims and ideals. Of

course they will have their troubles and difficulties as teachers. Some of their pupils will be less receptive than others, some will be obstinate at times and perverse, some will be led astray and be prone to go wrong, though often rewarding the patience of their teachers by eventual repentance and reform. All these incidents of a responsible profession Catholic teachers, like others, must be prepared to face, but they have this at least to sustain them and reward them, thanks to the superior instruments in their hands, that they can count on a large proportion of their pupils growing up confirmed in their attachment to the Catholic faith and faithful to its duties; and so they can set a precedent to their fellow-teachers of other faiths, which if they strive to follow they can have something better to look forward to than the disastrous spectacle of unhealthy results which *The Times* writer would have them believe is inevitable.

S. F. S.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON AND IRISH SOLDIERS.

THE crying need of a Handbook of Controversy such as we have from time to time suggested,—a Manual, that is, which should give in dictionary form either the refutation, or at any rate references to the means of refuting, the prevalent misstatements about Catholics—was recently impressed upon us by a fruitless endeavour either to verify or to demolish the authenticity of the frequently-quoted eulogy of his Irish soldiers ascribed to the Duke of Wellington during the Emancipation debates. We could not trace it further back than its usual sources—General Butler's "A Plea for the Peasant" in *Fraser's Magazine* (1878), Ruskin's *Our Fathers have told us* (1880), and Miss Cusack's *Life of the Liberator* (1872). Ruskin confessedly took the passage from Butler and he possibly may have found it in Miss Cusack's book. But the other day a reference to the quotation appearing in the *Examiner* (Bombay) for Aug. 3 showed us that all the while the clues lay in the back files of our contemporary, *The Tablet*, whence it should have been transferred, with much other valuable matter, to our controversial dictionary, had that much desired compilation ever seen the light. As long ago as 1903, it appears, the genuineness of the quotation was queried by a writer in *The Tablet*, who stated that it was not to be found in Hansard and that the late Father Morris of the Oratory had, at the end of a long quest, failed to connect it in any way with the Duke. That query was lucky enough to meet with a speedy and satisfactory answer from a correspondent, who had discovered the whole passage in the Earl

of Shrewsbury's able apologetic work *Reasons for not taking the test*, etc., published in 1828. In his introduction, written in January of that year, the Earl, after remarking that the accession of the Duke of Wellington to the Premiership boded ill for Catholic Emancipation, proceeds to enlarge upon the many personal reasons which might be presumed to move the Duke to espouse the Catholic cause—

Were it not [he wrote] for his Catholic troops, the Duke of Wellington had never gathered one solitary laurel—for all the laurels which he wears have sprung from their valour and have been watered by their blood :—but for the confidence reposed in him by Catholic Governments, he had never been carried forward in his career ;—but for the honours heaped upon him by Catholic monarchs, his breast had never blazed with half that brilliancy which beams upon it now ; and many of those high-sounding titles, which so loudly proclaim his glory to the world, would have been mute.

And then the Earl went on to suggest how in his present position the Premier might requite those to whom he owed so much, putting into his mouth the long and eloquent passage which somehow or other was afterwards taken to be the Duke's own utterance.

How would it not brighten all his fame and crown all his honours thus to address the House (upon the first occasion of a debate on the question of Catholic Emancipation) as the champion of that ill-fated land, for whose welfare, equally with that of every other portion of the empire, his Sovereign has now placed the reins of State in his hands : a land which, while it gave *him* birth has also the merit of having been the fostering parent of those companions in arms of whose services he speaks so feelingly, and for whose reward he is so impatient.

Then follows what the Duke, in Lord Shrewsbury's opinion, should have said, expressed in the fine rhetorical style of a period when oratory was cultivated as an art, and setting forth in much detail the gross incongruity of denying citizen rights to those through whose valour and self-sacrifice the State had been preserved. The passage is a very long one and none of those who quote it give it in full. In General Butler's version, it is a mere fragment, and two portions of it have been curiously transposed. It is almost certain that both he and Miss Cusack took it from a footnote in O'Callaghan's *History of the Irish Brigades* (1870 : pp. 615-6), where it occurs in its most extended form and is ascribed

directly to the Duke, speaking in the House of Lords. Whether the blunder is due in the first instance to O'Callaghan's carelessness or not, we have not examined, nor is it indeed of much concern. The spurious character of the quotation is put beyond all doubt by a postscript added to the passage by the Earl of Shrewsbury in a second edition of his book (September, 1828) which begins—

The brilliant opportunity has occurred, but has been suffered to pass, without placing the civic crown upon the laurelled temples of the premier. He has invited us, however, to sport in a gleam of hope, and to direct our views to brighter prospects. "Cease to agitate, and perhaps something may be done," certainly indicates the possibility of an adjustment.

It may be, though we are not aware of it, that even since *The Tablet* exposure, the quotation has been taken as a genuine utterance of Wellington's. We believe that one of the Protestant societies still circulates it as a signal instance of Catholic falsification! But it has a real value for us still as showing how generously in those days a great English Catholic peer could appreciate the military services of the Irish peasantry and the secular woes of Ireland. The concluding words which the Earl ascribes to the Duke have a pathetic ring to-day, almost exactly ninety years after they were written—

I glory, my lords, in the name of Ireland, and it is the highest pleasure I can ambition to be thus united with the rest of my kindred, in the grateful task of closing the wounds which seven centuries of misgovernment have inflicted upon that unfortunate land.

J. K.

ORANGEISM NINETY YEARS AGO.

THERE is much of present-day interest in Lord Shrewsbury's volume, besides what relates to the Wellington quotation. He makes clear that the last and the fiercest opposition to Catholic Emancipation came from the Anglican Bishops in fear for their emoluments, and the Orange faction in fear for their ascendancy. The latter body, which still remains unchanged in spirit and in aim, to embitter political disputes with religious rancour in Ireland, Canada, and Australia, he characterizes in terms which lack nothing of vigour and truth.

The hand of the Orangeman [he writes] is on his sword threatening to uphold by force what he does not even pretend

to defend by argument . . . They have told us that they would prefer the arrogance of dominion over the remnant of a nation . . . to the tranquil and extended happiness of millions, when that happiness is to be won by an equality of rights, and by the extinction of an odious monopoly.

And he pleads for the forcible suppression of Orangeism "that proud, selfish, obstinate, vindictive, and tyrannical ascendancy which has so long been the bane of England and the curse of Ireland."

The Orange Society had in fact been already suppressed by law in 1813, as the source of terrible evils in Ireland, and *The Times*, which seems to have been in those days better informed regarding its character, protested vehemently against its establishment in England.

We have lately remarked, [it wrote editorially on June 9, 1813] not without the detestation which they merit, some abortive attempts to introduce into this country a system which, in the Sister Kingdom, has so fatally tended to convert party animosities into lawless violence and vindictive ferocity. . . . It was, therefore, with extreme astonishment that we yesterday saw a journal, which has a character to lose, admit into its columns an open and unblushing recommendation of the institution of *Orange Lodges* in England, in avowed imitation of those happy inventions which under the same title have helped to drench Ireland with blood.

Lord Shrewsbury, in his second edition (p. cxxi) quotes from the same journal a long denunciation of Orangeism, published in August, 1828, some extracts from which may be given as showing the persistence of its *ethos* to the present day and the continued failure of the authorities to deal effectively with it.

Unwillingly assenting to the fact that no dissolution of this dangerous body [the armed Orangemen of Ireland] has ever been designed by his Majesty's Government, it is not easy to express our uneasiness at the avowal of a truth so ominous and unwelcome. We have long since affirmed that in the northern yeomanry were to be found the chief incendiaries of the Orange faction; and the thing is notorious everywhere . . . The opposite party [the Orangemen] never meets or moves without denouncing vengeance by armed violence against the Catholics: challenging its enemies to open combat and exclaiming against the King's Government for *persecution* of the Protestants and treason to the State the moment it ceases to go all lengths with these "exclusive loyalists," as

they call themselves, in their hatred and oppression of the great majority of the people. . . . Thus the peaceful Catholics are deprived of the use of arms while the Orangemen who have *no game left* but that of war, are equipped with musket, bayonet and ball cartridge: and this is to pass upon mankind as a system of equal justice and paternal government! . . . If Lord Anglesea be competent to keep down the armed violence of the Orange faction, would he not be still more competent to repress the same violence if *unarmed*? Would not the spirit of outrage be apt to evaporate in mere noisy demonstrations, if the implements of a more noxious species of atrocity were once taken away?

The present rulers of Ireland might do well to study these recommendations of *The Times* of 1828, the more so because they will find nothing similar in *The Times* of to-day. The Orange spirit alas! has not "evaporated" in the interval. To what lengths even now it can drive those obsessed by it may be gathered from a protest against Home Rule, published five years ago by the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland, which ran as follows;—

It will be for ever impossible to fight Home Rule successfully as long as it is contended or admitted that the Romanists and other open enemies of the true religion ought to have political power. We regard the so-called Catholic Emancipation Act as the "first plague spot" of the Home Rule evil. From the time of the passing of the Act, which gave Romanists the franchise, dates the beginning of their power to threaten the liberties of the Protestants of Ireland.

No one who ignores the presence of this frenzied fanaticism in Ireland can hope to understand the present unhappy situation; no one can remedy that situation so long as Orangeism is encouraged. It cannot be taken at its own value. Its character was aptly summed up by the *Edinburgh Review* as long ago as 1836, when as the result of a Select Parliamentary Committee on the subject, the House of Commons petitioned the King to put an end to the Society.

The Orangemen [wrote the *Edinburgh*] have had a fierce and firm faith in the truth and righteousness and utility of their pernicious institution. Founded on principles of exclusiveness and insolence, they have believed themselves to be meek and charitable; existing as a privileged minority amongst a conquered and oppressed population, they have considered themselves the injured and offended; combining against, or acting beyond the law, they have thought them-

selves the most loyal of subjects; and reprobating bigotry, they have been at best but the bigoted persecutors of imputed bigotry.

This strange power of self-delusion, or at any rate this utter divorce between theory and practice, has been well brought out in Mr. Anstruther's pamphlet *What is Orangeism?*¹ and in Bishop Cleary's larger volume *The Orange Society*¹ which, candid, thorough and fully-documented, is a damning exposure of this "pernicious institution," unanswered because unanswerable. Yet this un-Christian, undemocratic anti-civic sect, whose main *raison d'être* is the destruction of Catholicism,² is still countenanced, praised and supported, to the disturbance of our domestic peace, by those who are anti-Catholics first and Englishmen afterwards.

J. K.

THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY.

THE recent publication of portions of the correspondence of the late Lord Acton has awakened here and there the echoes of old historical controversies. It is not perhaps surprising that churchmen of the type that find refreshment in the activities of the Protestant Alliance should be glad to invoke the patronage of a Cambridge Professor of Modern History who was at the same time a professing Catholic. But Lord Acton, all through his life, and especially during the troubled days of the Vatican Decrees and the Old Catholic revolt, found it very difficult to hold the scales of justice even, in estimating the attitude of the 16th century Popes towards Huguenots and Lutherans. We are not suggesting that their standpoint was one which we should be glad to see adopted by the authorities of the Church in our own day. Unable to persuade themselves that Western Christendom in fifty years had grown so diseased that the infection of heterodoxy had penetrated the whole system, Pius V. and Gregory XIII. believed that by drastic remedies, by purging and the cautery, the poison might still be eliminated. There are not a few in our own day who express similar views regarding what they hold to be the noxious growth of trades-unionism, or pacifism, or Sinn-Feinism. How many times have we heard it said by extremists that the only way to deal with Sinn Fein was to appoint a dictator who would arrest all the leaders and shoot the lot of

¹ Both published by the C. T. S. at 1d. and 2s. 6d. net, respectively.

² "Is it not sheer hypocrisy for us to try and hide the fact that the object of our existence is opposition to the Church of Rome." Q. T. Vale, Deputy Grand Master at Melbourne, in 1893. See also "Loyal Songs," an exposure of the Orange Spirit, by J. Britten, *THE MONTH*, March, 1913.

them! We need not be surprised when Lord Acton is horrified at Pope Gregory XIII.'s ruthless desire to see France cleared of Huguenots, or when he denounces the medal commemorating the massacre (*Ugonottorum Strages*), as well as the bonfires, the Jubilee, and the Pope's unrestrained expressions of satisfaction. Still, two or three things should be remembered from which the historian, writing in 1869 and 1874, seemed deliberately to avert his gaze.¹

First, it is quite certain that when Gregory drafted the Jubilee Bull he had not yet had time to receive the dispatch from Salviati, his Nuncio in Paris, telling him that the supposition of a Huguenot conspiracy was ridiculous. Lord Acton argues as if the Pope, on Sept. 11th, when the Bull was published, was fully informed of the state of the case. But Salviati's dispatch was written on Sept. 2nd, and could not well have reached Rome before Sept. 14th. On the other hand, it is beyond doubt that the King's special envoy, arriving much earlier, had been instructed to represent the massacre to His Holiness as "the repression of a vast conspiracy, organized by the Huguenot leaders, which threatened the King himself, the royal family, and the very existence of the Catholic faith."²

In this way the Pope, even if he were only too ready to adopt the suggestion, could at least salve his conscience with the belief that the massacre was a legitimate act of the royal authority forestalling rebellion. Secondly, it is now universally admitted, contrary to Lord Acton's contention, that the terrible slaughter which began on Aug. 24th, was unpremeditated. "There is no reason for doubting," writes Professor J. W. Thompson, "that the massacre of St. Bartholomew was unpremeditated. It was not plotted years before, or even many days before. The light of modern investigation has proved this to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced historian, whether Protestant or Catholic."³

The words of this History Professor of Chicago carry the more weight because Professor Henri Hauser, in his *Sources de l'Histoire de France*, recommends this book as the most reliable discussion of the subject. Another important fact, too often overlooked, is that the Pope, down to the very end of August, 1572, believed that both Charles IX. and Catharine de Medici were playing directly into the hands of the Huguenots. His joy at this conclusive proof that his fears were not justified

¹ Lord Acton's longer article on the St. Bartholomew massacre was published in the *North British Review*, Oct., 1869. He reverts to the subject in his letter to *The Times* of 24 Nov., 1874.

² See J. Guiraud, *Histoire partielle, Histoire Vraie*, Vol. II., pp. 432-459 (1912).

³ *The Wars of Religion in France* (1909), p. 451.

was proportionately great. Lastly, we really do not know the Roman side of this story. Professor Hauser himself declares: "Le dernier mot, n' a pas été dit faute, d'une suffisante documentation 'vaticane' sur la Saint-Barthélémy."

H. T.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

Progress on all Fronts.

It looks as if Germany's stupendous war-machine were at last breaking down. It is hard for us to realize the utter confidence our foes had in its indestructibility. It was a matter of national faith with them, fostered by generations of military training, and nearly all the events of the war have hitherto been made to confirm it. Our failures in Gallipoli and Mesopotamia, the disappearance from the field of Russia and Rumania, the crushing defeat of Italy in October last year—one can imagine how these events increased the enemy's confidence, which the alternate advances and retirements "according to plan" on the Western Front did nothing to impair. The salient fact that the Teutonic armies are everywhere fighting upon enemy soil and that the Fatherland, except indeed for air-raids on the Rhine towns, is secure from attack, gives a seemingly solid basis to the belief in Germany's invincibility. But that belief is now waning and the process is plainly visible in the various utterances of her statesmen and soldiers. The struggle is painted as desperate, the peace-terms expressed or suggested, though still arrogant and impossible, fall far short of the original Prussian aims, the Kaiser and the Crown Prince are proclaiming their innocence of aggressive designs, the mighty Hindenburg is seemingly suffering from nerves, and Austria, which started the whole wicked business, is making a probably sincere and a certainly belated effort to end it. If only the Allies would in their answer to this proposal unite in defining what are, and *what are not*, their reasons for continuing to fight, and would especially declare in President Wilson's words, that "no one is threatening the existence, the independence, the peaceful enterprise of the German Empire,"¹ that "no nation or people shall be robbed or punished because the irresponsible rulers of a single country have themselves done deep and abominable wrong,"¹ and that having destroyed militarism "we shall be free to base peace on generosity and justice, to the exclusion of selfish claims to advantage even on the part of the victors"¹ then we should

¹ Address to Congress, Dec. 4, 1917.

accelerate that conversion of our foes, which over-confidence and desperation alike might indefinitely delay.

**No Peace
with
Autocracy.**

It is for German people themselves to decide whether the giving up of their war-philosophy, which creates a perpetual menace to human liberty, involves too the destruction of the political system which embodies that philosophy. When "this intolerable thing of which the masters of Germany have shown us the ugly face, this menace of combined intrigue and force which we now see so clearly as the German Power, a thing without conscience or honour or capacity for covenanted peace"¹ has been crushed as it must be, will the Germans want to keep the body which enshrined so evil a spirit? The German Chancellor on Sept. 5th, in postponing discussion of the general equal suffrage proposals sent to the Prussian Upper House from the Lower, said that such measures must give way "to greater tasks—namely, the protection of the most precious treasures of our political life, the dynasty and the crown." If the German people endorse those words and persist in maintaining the military autocracy which has led them to moral and material bankruptcy, then they will shut themselves out from the intercourse of free peoples and deserve all the consequences of that penal ostracism.

**The Jingoos
at
Home.**

"Every lover of mankind, every sane and thoughtful man must take for granted that Peace must be followed by a definite concert of the Powers which will make it virtually impossible that any such catastrophe should ever overwhelm us again."² Judged by the President's criterion there are not a few writers amongst us who are neither "lovers of mankind" nor can claim to be "sane and thoughtful." Although the adhesion of statesmen to the "League of Nations" project is becoming more and more definite and pronounced, our Jingoos are still bitterly hostile to it, for it is incompatible with their fundamental principle that every nation must in the long run be a law unto itself and a judge in its own cause. They cannot rise to the conception of a good higher and more imperative than the merely national, though the idea is familiar to every Catholic. They do not think that international honesty is the best policy. They cannot even realize the truth of President Wilson's great dictum, uttered one month before Germany committed that black international crime, the violation of Belgium's neutrality—"The most distinguished nation in the world is the nation which can, and will, keep its promises

¹ President Wilson, Address to Congress, Dec. 4, 1917.

² President Wilson, *ibid.*

even to its own hurt." And so in all our reviews, writers unable to transcend the mentality in which they have grown old, doctrinaire professors, retired major-generals, militarists and agnostic philosophers dismiss with a scornful phrase or two a project upon which the whole hope of humanity depends, an ideal the failure of which means that this war's colossal sacrifices will all have been in vain.

Its realization is the anxious concern of all true statesmen from the Holy Father downwards, yet even Catholics are found to laugh at it as a chimera, without even taking the trouble to learn what it means and implies.¹ As long ago as 1896 Cardinals Gibbons, Logue, and Vaughan, representing English-speaking Catholicism, pleaded for the establishment of a Tribunal of Arbitration "as a rational substitute for a resort to the bloody arbitrament of war," and the late Cardinal Farley of New York, shortly before his lamented death, joined Cardinal Gibbons as one of the Vice-Presidents of the American "League to Enforce Peace." This attitude of the leaders of our Faith should surely awaken Catholics to the fact that God intended Christianity to be the limit and corrective of the principle of nationality, which, allowed to grow unchecked by law, is the constant source of international friction.

**Nationalism
and**

Internationalism.

Accordingly we hail the Premier's bold and clear declaration at Manchester on Sept. 12th: "This must be the last war, the last or, believe me, . . . there are men here to-day who will see the last of civilization,"—with delight, as it shows that the most powerful man in this country to-day has at heart the accomplishment of the one object that can justify a conflict on this scale.

I am for a League of Nations [went on Mr. George], in fact, the League of Nations has begun. The British Empire is a League of Nations. The Allied Countries which are fighting the battle of international right are all a League of Nations. If, after the war, Germany repudiates and condemns her perfidy, or rather the perfidy of her rulers, then a Germany freed from military domination will be welcome into the great League of Nations.

These are bold words and should do much to convince the ignorant and the doubtful that there is really no choice between abolishing war and *preparations for war*, and provoking Armageddon.

¹ See correspondence in *The Universe*, Sept. 1918, a paper which otherwise is doing good service by a reasoned exposition of the sound Christian basis of the "League of Nations" theory.

In America, thanks to the steady, lucid, incisive exposition of President Wilson, that ideal is accepted as the supreme war-aim. Unhappily Mr. Roosevelt, the man of the "big stick," seems incapable of receiving the President's teaching. He spoke on "Lafayette" Day (Sept. 6th) as if regard for the interests of humanity were incompatible with patriotism, a view which *The Times* (August 1st) styles "the most pestilent of current political heresies,"

whereas devotion to country, determination to make the best of land and race, measures to secure their independence of aggression and penetration—these things are no more incompatible with the League of Nations project than village or county pride is incompatible with love of England, or the patriotism of New Zealand and Canada with allegiance to the British Commonwealth. The larger loyalty can never supersede the lesser.

We believe that the more the matter is studied the more it will appear that the real opposition to the notion of the peoples of the world living in harmony in common obedience to the law of justice comes from those who have imbibed, consciously or unconsciously, the Prussian theory of the absolute State. Unless Might is Right, there is something higher than the national will embodied in armaments, and to that something the nation should always be ready to submit.

**Chauvinism
formally
repudiated.**

Another striking point in the Premier's Manchester speech was his emphatic repudiation of Chauvinism. For the first time since the war began has this diseased development of nationality been stigmatized in public by a responsible British statesman. The pacifists have been denounced often enough—those who mistrust the motives of the Government and think that, were all the truth known, both sides would be seen to be Prussian in spirit, and those strange theorists who hold that even a war of defence is immoral—but the over-blown patriots, the *delenda est Germania* folk, the war-traders, the "England ueber Alles" gentlemen, the Jingo journalists that flourish in the *Morning Post* and papers of its sort, these and their pestiferous works have been treated with strange tenderness by men in power. But now—"Nor can we," said Mr. Lloyd George, "allow the Chauvinists to impose terms that will leave a stain upon the conscience of the Allied peoples and subject them to the inevitable punishment that wrong-doing brings in its train. We must not arm Germany with a real wrong." The language is moderate but it is significant: it is something that the existence at any rate of British Chauvinists is officially admitted, and more, that their militarist pro-

gramme is officially turned down. The destruction of Germany, whether economic or political, is no part of our war-aims.

**Labour
and the Abolition
of War.**

We have before remarked that this fire-eating clique seems curiously blind to the signs of the times. During these last weeks we have had two Labour gatherings, one British at Derby (Sept. 2—9) and the other Inter-Allied in London (Sept. 17—20). Although we may take it that in the main the object of the various Labour parties amongst the Allies is, in the words of the American Labour Mission,¹ "to stand behind our respective democratic Governments to win the war for justice, freedom, and democracy," they will certainly not stand behind any Government after the war which is not democratic. They will certainly not endorse any policy which involves military conscription or which by increasing indirect taxation throws a disproportionate burden on the labouring classes. Cannot our militarists read the portent conveyed in the fact that after the war, besides claiming representation at the Peace Congress, Labour intends to meet internationally and discuss independently of the diplomats, the re-constitution of the world? If working-men, the majority of every nation, will no longer waste their labour in unproductive tasks such as armament manufacture, if they will no longer enlist as soldiers, what will the militarists do then? It were wiser for them to make their peace with democracy betimes and, instead of growling and threatening behind class-barriers, aim at true national unity by the pursuit of truly national interests.

The way to avert class warfare is to abandon privilege which is not due to merit and power which is divorced from responsibility. The Red Terror which is now ruining Russia may be far enough from our doors, but unless the social evils which give countenance and pretext for the errors of Socialism are remedied by those whose apathy or selfishness have caused them, it will come appreciably nearer. If Christianity, which means social justice, tempered and sweetened by brotherly affection, is not applied, the socialist programme, hitherto affecting only a section of the Labour party, will be adopted by practically all.

**Multiplication
of
Parties.**

Nothing is more remarkable in these latter days of the war than the growth of political organizations outside and athwart the historical parties. As most of them have been called into being by divergence of war-aims and war-methods, they will probably not survive the declaration of peace. Meanwhile their mere enumeration will give some indication of the political ferment caused by the reactions of war. The chief are—

¹ "Message to the British Nation", Aug. 29.

The *National Party*, which seems to be essentially a revolt from the traditional Conservatives.

The *National Alliance of Employers and Employed*, an organization which, admirable in its aim, has not yet won the confidence of those most concerned.

The *British Workers' League*, which was once called "The National Democratic and Labour Party," but is not recognized by "Labour."

The *Liberal Democratic Union*, a group of advanced Liberals.

The *Women's Party*, probably the forerunner of a number of others.

Besides these there are several "freak" parties, such as Mr. P. Billing's discredited "Vigilantes," and other signs of disintegration amongst the old organizations—Labour being especially fissile because of its Socialist wing, whilst in Ireland we are confronted by the portent of Sinn Féin. The result of a General Election in these circumstances would seem to defy the most expert calculations.

The Strike Portent.

The only party which makes no headway is that of the Pacifists, under whatever name they enrol themselves. The Allied belligerents do not doubt, nor have ever doubted, that this is a conflict between two world-philosophies which may be roughly styled the autocratic and the democratic, and that it must be fought to a close. The unanimous acceptance, by the Inter-allied Labour Conference, of President Wilson's "fourteen propositions" to form the foundation of a world-peace is the most significant outcome of its deliberations, for the President has no illusions about the necessity of destroying the whole militarist system everywhere. But concurrently with these deliberations and in seeming contradiction to their spirit, a series of strikes and threats of strikes have been convulsing the industrial world. The bus-conductors, the London police, the cotton-spinners, the shipwrights, the miners, the railway-men—there is hardly an industry which, in this hour of growing triumph, has not clouded our vision and weakened our efforts by some intrusion of its sectional interests. It is indeed hard for a democracy to wage war, especially a democracy in the making and very far from its perfect form. And the tragedy is that it is the very zeal for justice awakened in men's breasts by our cause which has this awkward repercussion at home. People are now more alive to the many iniquities of our social and industrial system, and, in a sense, it is right and natural that they should say to their rulers—"Physicians, cure yourselves. You are sending us to fight for freedom and justice abroad: give us then what we should not have to fight for—freedom and justice at home." But alas! it is not easy to conduct

a foreign war and a domestic reformation at the same time. It is admitted that the bus-women, the police, the cotton-spinners, had justice on their side, and that they had tried in vain to secure it by peaceable methods. In other cases we fear that a selfish individualism, a trace of the Bolshevik spirit, has prompted the cessation of work essential for the public welfare. However, the traditional method of dealing with workers on strike has always been to resist their demands until the consequences of resisting are seen to be rather worse than those of concession. And that sacred but incredibly foolish method has been adhered to consistently with the worst results. If people are convinced that they cannot get their rights without fighting, they will fight; and if they know that their demands are never fully granted, they will ask more than they have a right to. The one remedy for labour trouble which has never yet been consistently and universally applied is to recognize adequately the worker's main right, viz., to be treated not as a hand, but as a human being.¹

A useful summary of the Christian principles which should inspire the social and national reformation of which we stand in need was drawn up a few months ago by an active Anglican body "The Life and Liberty Movement," and may be cited as showing how far society is at present unaffected by them. We underline one principle of special importance in regard to the task of reconstruction after the war. Hitherto society has been divided into producers and parasites: henceforward, there should be only the former class. Recognition of the subjoined facts, then, will mark the healthy State—

(a) The all-embracing sovereignty of God, in Whose Kingdom all nations are provinces; so that every nation should regard itself, not as the final end of its own policy, but as fulfilling its own destiny in so far as it serves the Divine Kingdom, of which Kingdom the State must learn to regard itself as a minister;

(b) The sanctity of personality, since every man or woman is a child of God;

(c) The obligation of fellowship, since all are members of the family of God;

(d) *The duty of work, since "If a man will not work neither let him eat" is only another way of saying 'Thou shalt not steal.'*

(e) The comparative unimportance of material wealth and social position, provided that the requisites of a complete human life are secured;

¹ Thus embodied as a "fundamental declaration" in the demands of the American Labour Party—"That in law and in practice the principle shall be recognized that the labour of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce." (*The Times*, Sept. 19th.)

(f) The supremacy of the law of Christ over the conduct of corporate bodies, no less than over that of individuals.

And, as the summary indicates, the adoption of these principles would have a revolutionary effect in the social and industrial order—

in securing a reasonable minimum in goods, conditions, leisure, and status to all workers, or fixing a reasonable maximum to be received in the shape of profits; in prohibiting unscrupulous competition; in evolving the ethical basis which should regulate the administration of joint stock companies, and the like; in checking the exploitation of public need for private advantage; in upholding a high standard of honour and integrity in public life; in declaring that true social health depends on the acceptance of standards of value other than those of power or material wealth.

The Prime Minister in his Manchester speech also gave a sketch of social reforms which are long overdue, a rapid and superficial sketch laying most stress on utilitarian motives. Health he put in the forefront—"You cannot maintain an A1 Empire with a C3 population"—showing that "man-power" was in his mind. And then he mentioned decent housing as a means to health. It is a means, as we know, to much more,—self-respect, self-control, manners and morals—and it should be occupying the attention of all who want at last to make a start in civilizing the nation. "We have talked about it, we have played with it for 40 or 50 years. But it has never been really taken in hand." We trust that Mr. Lloyd George will remove that reproach.

**The Eugenist
attack upon
the Poor.**

A singular, if indirect, light is thrown upon the present home conditions of many of the workers by the recent formation of "The Mothers' Defence League,"¹ the general objects of which are "to defend the rights of motherhood, to secure justice in the treatment of the working-mother, to oppose measures which introduce State-control of the family or which unduly interfere with the natural rights of parents in the custody of their children, and to ascertain and represent the views of working-mothers in regard to social measures affecting them." It is clear that this organization has come into being to meet the attack made by eugenists and health-cranks on the integrity and autonomy of the family. As we have often pointed out, the State is obliged to secure for its members conditions of life which are not gravely hurtful to health and, in the interests of the community, to limit the incidence of disease. To such hygienic laws well-disposed citizens will give proper heed. But it is quite a different thing when a group of "scientific" doctrinaires, well-meaning, no doubt, but with ideas concerning

¹ Offices, 3 Fleet Street, W.C. 2.

marriage, the family and human destiny generally, alien to the Christian tradition, wish to foist their peculiar views upon the community at large. Not all health visitors and welfare-workers, of course, are eugenisists, and until housing conditions are improved much interference with the domesticities of the poor may be necessary in the public interest, but they are often affected by eugenist heresies, especially in regard to the practice of birth-control. The leaders of that movement make no secret of their aim: they wish the State to attend to the breeding of its citizens, as the stock-raiser does in regard to his cattle, though they camouflage their pernicious proposals in vague and plausible terms. "Obviously" [said Major Darwin at a recent Eugenist meeting at Oxford: *italics ours*]

their aim should be to *make* parents endowed with *bad or inferior natural* qualities have smaller families, and almost as obviously they wanted healthy and naturally capable parents to take a greater part than at present in passing on the stream of human raw material to prosperity.

Our readers will notice the little word "make," implying forcible interference with, and control of, the most sacred of human relationships, and the skilful insinuation that the "inferior" families should only be "smaller," whereas the argument requires that there should be none.

But some further words of the same Eugenist shows more plainly the danger, to guard against which "The Mothers' Defence League" has been instituted. "When this question" [he says]

came to be *practically* dealt with, what they *hoped and believed* was that social reformers would before long find themselves co-operating with the eugenists in *ways that they did not now fully foresee*.

That "The Mothers' Defence League" may be instrumental in making that "hope and belief" illusory and vain will be the prayer of all true Christians.¹

A Typical Eugenist.

To what lengths the pursuit of this one-sided physical ideal will lead even educated women may be seen in an article by Dr. Marie Stopes in the *Sunday Chronicle* (August 10th), wherein she roundly states that people who will not admit the right of the civil authorities to decide whether they should be parents or not "must be treated as criminals." It is natural, we suppose, for doctors to be preoccupied with the question of health, but even they should know that health is not an absolute good to which morality itself should be sacrificed. "Everyone must know [she writes] there are thousands of citizens whose children will in-

¹ If our readers want a more detailed justification of our opinion of the eugenists, they may consult that valuable C.S.G. pamphlet, *The Church and Eugenics*, (8d. net), by the late Father T. Gerrard.

evitably make work for the Ministry of Health," and she goes on to recommend in veiled language a remedy abhorrent to humanity and decency alike. We are not calling into question Dr. Stopes' good intentions in all this, although she has written an unsound book upon marriage and a play of the "unpleasant" variety: she is merely a typical eugenist, one of those who have abandoned the Christian ideal, one of those who, unless Christians bestir themselves, will try to imbue our social legislation with the principles of paganism.

**Soul-snatching
in
Palestine
and elsewhere.**

The complete delivery of the Holy Land from the sway of the infidel by General Allenby's troops is one of the brightest of the many cheering items of war-news recently received. The Turk does not belong to the civilized races, though he has many natural virtues not over-conspicuous amongst ourselves. And so, that he should rule Christian peoples, even though he should rule them well, is in itself something of an outrage. But that he should rule them as he has done has been one of those international crimes that have merited this international war. Palestine is now free: the Zionists, if they will, may occupy its every corner, and Christians will have unimpeded access to the cradle of their faith. But there is a worse evil than even Turkish rule to be dreaded in emancipated Palestine, an evil which threatens the faith of poor Catholics. Towards the end of August Cardinal Logue published a letter from the Vicar General of the Catholic Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem, which complained of anti-Catholic discrimination in the administration of relief-funds and of Catholics being made to join in Protestant worship as a condition to obtaining relief-work. "It would be lamentable," says the Cardinal, "if Catholics of Palestine and Syria should wish to be back under the rule of the Turks," who at least treated all forms of Christian faith equally.

The same evil spirit has been at work in France where a determined effort was made, as we have before mentioned, to seduce from Catholicism the orphan children of the fallen by withholding financial support from all who were being educated under Catholic auspices. But, thanks to the fearless exposure of this iniquity by *La Croix* and other French journals and publicists, the *Loi sur les Pupilles de la Nation* has been modified so as to protect the most cherished possession of these little ones. Unfortunately, as we learn from our contemporary, *America*,¹ proselytism still rules the administration of the immense sum, 200,000,000 francs, contributed in the States to help on the work of adopting French orphans. This must be contrary to the wishes of the vast majority of contributors, who surely cannot sympathize with this mean and dastardly work of robbing helpless children of

¹ August 24, p. 478.

their faith; a work, be it noted, still countenanced in Ireland by subscribers to the "Irish Church Missions," an organization, as the *Church Times* calls it, "for the perversion of one set of Christians by another."

**The Catholic
Truth
Society.**

That the interests and spread of the Faith should so constantly be involved in merely material concerns like the raising of money is one of the mysteries of God's Providence. No doubt the pressure of poverty keeps, or may keep, the soul mindful of its dependence upon God, but it has also many less salutary effects. To-day, for instance, there is an immense call for the productions of the Catholic Truth Society. Religious truth, which that Society exists to disseminate, is widely in demand, but alas! the price of paper prevents the production and sale of penny pamphlets—its main method of apostolate—except at a ruinous loss. The alternative before it, therefore, is either to cease producing and reprinting this most necessary matter or to appeal for assistance to those whose zeal for the Catholic faith is awakened by the opportunities of the times. No better investment exists, of the many open to the public to-day, than this form of "lending to the Lord."

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Penance in the New Code [S. Woywod, O.F.M., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, July, 1918, p. 22].

Private Judgment, Right and Wrong Uses of [H. E. Hall in *Catholic Gazette*, Sept., 1918].

Woman's Soul, The Maçon Myth further refuted [Rev. C. F. Aiken in *Ecclesiastical Review*, July, 1918, p. 1].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

France: Religion of War-Orphans endangered [J. H. Fisher in *America*, July 13, 20, 1918, pp. 327, 349].

Pope's Work for War-Prisoners [*Civiltà Cattolica*, Sept. 7, 1918, p. 396].

Renan, Studies upon [Pierre Guilloux in *Etudes*, Sept. 5 and 20, 1918].

Russia, The Church under the Soviets [J. D. Fox in *Month*, Oct., 1918, p. 258].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Birth-Rate, Decline of in U.S.A. [J. J. Walsh in *America*, July 6, 1918, p. 303].

Canada, French and the War [L. de Grandmaison in *Etudes*, Sept. 5, 1918, p. 542].

Cinema: the Censorship in Chicago [F. G. Dinneen, S.J., in *America*, July 20, 1918, p. 351].

Cinema and Morals, The [E. F. Garesché, S.J., in *The Queen's Work*, August, 1918, p. 37].

French Representation at the Vatican [Yves de la Brière in *Etudes*, July 5 and 20, 1918].

REVIEWS

I—THE SOUL OF A NATION¹

FOUR long years have dragged their weary course since that heart-breaking autumn of 1914, when the London stations were crowded with scared, homeless refugees, fleeing before the onrush of a pitiless invader. The newspapers have given us some description, as detailed by eye-witnesses, of the events of those earlier days in Belgium. But Marcel Wyseur, the Flemish poet, more perhaps than any other writer, shows us in his volume, *Les Cloches de Flandre*, the Belgian people and the Belgian landscape as they are at the present time, for poetry is both more intimate and self-revealing than any newspaper article. We who have known that unhappy country in her days of plenty, when her farm lands, though more limited in area than many in England, were cultivated down to the last foot of ground, can hardly recognize this grey, wasted land:—

O Flandre, dans tes champs ou sont les moissons d'or
Dont la houle profonde, en vagues de lumière,
Déferlait lentement aux jours de messidor
Vers tes horizons droits comme des murs de pierre?

As far as eye can see "nothing but crosses, hundreds of crosses."

The canals, where formerly the laden coal-barges came on their slow passage from the river mouth to the little towns, are now deserted; the wayside hostelry, where the bargemen would stop for a glass of beer and a chat, have been razed to the ground. The busy towns of Dixmude, Ypres, and Nieuport are but a heap of ruins: and those villages that are still standing seem like a body without a soul; wooden shutters bar the windows, the hinges of the doors are rusted from disuse; the forlorn little shrine to Our Lady at the street corner has no candle in the broken socket; if by chance a footfall is heard approaching, it echoes "like lead on a coffin."

One of the most striking poems in the collection describes how Death, "teeth chattering and bones rattling," came down the road on winter evenings, "tuer des pauvres gens," pausing here and there to take his toll of old and young; but now he roams abroad no more, for the villages are deserted, and there is no one left for him to take; men, women, and children are gone, therefore:

¹ *Les Cloches de Flandre*. By Marcel Wyseur. Paris. Perrin et Cie. Pp. 228. Price, 4.55 fr. 1918.

La Mort,
 Hideuse et blême,
 Dans la tranchée
 S'est embusquée
 Pour prendre et pour tuer encor,
 Pour prendre et pour tuer *quand même* !¹

Those families that are left, for there are many even in Belgium whose houses have been left standing, have wives and mothers always waiting; they strain their eyes at eventide to peer down the shadowy street, hoping to see the dear familiar figure who will never return. The great Calvary stands forlorn at the cross-roads; no longer the sorrowing mother comes to kneel at His pierced feet to whisper her grief; the oldest inhabitants of the neighbourhood could not recollect the day when it was first placed there. For all their lives they had known that gaunt Figure, His arms outstretched towards the immensity of the plain, as if He would draw to Himself the griefs of the whole world. To-day the Christ is left solitary; He has seen the sad procession of old and young,

Ces gens minables des déroutes,
 Il les eut vu descendre
 Dans l'ombre énorme et dans l'effroi,
 Christ se sentait mourir pour la deuxième fois !²

Where are the wonderful belfrys of old Flanders? The three great towers of Antwerp, Bruges, and Ghent are still standing, grim landmarks that seem to defy the fury of the invader. Others are also in their place, but the beautiful bells, the glory of Belgium, have been stricken to the ground. No longer the rhythmic carillons come lilting over the plains and waterways:

Tous les clochers de Flandre ont des trous dans leurs âmes.³

The turrets have great fissures in their sides, and through these gaping wounds the winter storms are working their will and completing the work of destruction.

No collection of Belgian verse would be complete without some reference to the heroic King and his Queen, lovingly named "la Reine errante" by reason of her continual movement among the Belgian troops. "La Maison de la Grève" describes the little house on the dunes washed by the sea-spray, where the royal family have taken refuge. Nothing is left them of the pomp and grandeur of former days but two priceless possessions: their honour and the love of their people.

Perhaps it is hardly surprising that these pages describe

¹ "La Mort."

² "La Calvaire."

³ "Clochers en Flandre."

almost exclusively the mists and snows of the Belgian climate; but one dainty little poem there is:

Les cloches ont prié dimanche sur la ville,¹

which seems to reflect the sunshine and peace of bygone days: others there are which describe the tranquil life of the old gabled towns, the nuns in their starched white caps flitting like birds down the narrow street to the old church. The Angelus rings out, and one church after another makes answer, while the clocks on the bell-towers strike the hours. There is a hum of voices in the convent workroom, the door is open into the garden, where the roses are in full bloom. But all this is only a memory, for those happy days have passed away: more in tune with the nation's sorrow are the day of falling rain, the clinging mists that envelope the whole landscape with a white veil, the fierce storms of winter and the dread snow, the black winter of the very poor. The moon makes a white pathway across the untrodden snow, where only the souls of the little children who have died in infancy may dare to pass. The great crows, harbingers of ill-luck, come winging their way across the deserted fields, the shadow of their black wings make crosses on the freshly fallen snow. Winter is terrible for the little orphans of Flanders:

Mon Dieu ! il fait grand froid d'hiver au pays de Flandre,
Et les petits enfants n'ont ni feu ni logis ;

. venez les prendre
Et chauffez-les ce soir en votre Paradis.

Ces pauvres, mettez-les dans la plus belle chambre
De votre maison bleue aux portes vermeils,
Puisque chez vous, mon Dieu, il ne fait pas Decembre
Et qu'il y a toujours des fleurs et du soleil.

Qu'ils soient heureux, là-bas, dans votre ciel si doux,
Et que votre Maman leur fasse oublier "l'Autre,"
Qui dort sous une croix, ils ne savent pas ou !²

What impression do we carry away from this volume of the mind of the Belgian people after four years' endurance of the German yoke? The oft-repeated lies concerning the Allied Nations, have they produced their desired effect and convinced the people of the invincibility of the German arms? M. Cammaerts assures us that these calumnies find no credence among his country-folk. These verses bear him out, showing us how they live in the past, feeding their minds on the memories of those happy days; like the ruined belfrys they still stand erect, waiting for the day of deliverance to dawn. And when they dare trust themselves to look ahead, their gaze penetrates to the far horizon, past the mists of this present time, and, like the Christ of the Calvary, "ils obtient d'espérance."

I. H.

¹ "Impression."

² "Prière Dolente pour les Petits Enfants de Flandre."

2—THE PRIESTLY VOCATION¹

THE limitations of space entailed by war conditions make it difficult to do justice to the admirable volume of conferences on the life and ideals of a secular priest which has just been published by the Bishop of Brentwood. No doubt the conception of the work is not altogether new. Both the late Bishop Hedley and Canon Keatinge have given us valuable books which cover more or less the same ground, but this is pre-eminently a topic in which the individuality of the teacher has plenty of scope, and Bishop Ward's long experience as President of St. Edmund's College, combined with his great personal popularity with students present and past, must have given him a quite exceptional knowledge of the difficulties and trials with which the young priest on the mission finds himself confronted. Apart from the sane and practical religious teaching, studiously avoiding all extravagance and overstatement, which pervades the whole work, the reader has only to glance casually through its pages to realize the desirability of some such competent exposition in view of the new conditions created within the last fifteen or twenty years. To begin with, the new *Codex* of Canon Law and the new Breviary must have a considerable bearing upon the priest's everyday life. It is needless to say that the author has shown himself well acquainted with the modifications thus introduced, and many of the clergy who have long left their student days behind them will probably be glad to learn something of what so experienced a guide has thought it desirable to draw attention to in all this recent legislation. Again, the two chapters devoted to "the Recreations of a Priest" give the writer the opportunity of offering some excellent advice on such up-to-date topics as the cinema, the music-hall, the bicycle, and the habit of cigarette smoking. On the high spiritual tone of the volume it would be superfluous to comment, but we may venture to make special reference to the admirable wisdom and directness of the advice contained in Chapter IV.

3—THE GLASTONBURY AUTOMATIC SCRIPT²

ALTHOUGH we differ profoundly from Mr. Paul Hookham and find it difficult to form any mental presentment of that theory of "a kind of *memoria mundi*" by which he seeks to explain

¹ *The Priestly Vocation: a Series of Fourteen Conferences addressed to the Secular Clergy.* By the Right Rev. Bernard Ward, F.R.Hist.S., Bishop of Brentwood (Vol. X. of the Westminster Library for Priests and Students). London: Longmans. Pp. xii. 176. Price, 5s. net. 1918.

² *Psychism, Glastonbury and "The Month."* By Paul Hookham. Oxford: Blackwell. Price 1s. 6d. 1918.

certain puzzling psychic phenomena, we should but for one circumstance have contented ourselves with simply acknowledging the copy of the pamphlet he has been good enough to send to us. The point upon which a word of reply seems needed is the charge of "unfair, and I am afraid, consciously unfair, bias in the Reviewer's mind," shown, he declares, when we were discussing Mr. Bligh Bond's *Gate of Remembrance* in our March number. We are accused of not really scrutinizing the facts upon their merits, though all the while pretending to do so, but of creating an atmosphere of prejudice against Mr. Bond upon issues that are entirely irrelevant. Let us frankly own, and indeed we said so in our article, that our faith in Mr. Bond as an investigator of psychic phenomena was seriously shaken when we learnt that he was a believer in the Cabala and in systems of Gematria. This we contend, is perfectly rational. Anyone who puts faith in that fantastic nonsense has proved himself incapable of weighing evidence. What may be the particular kink in his brain we cannot pretend to decide. In nine cases out of ten Bacon's famous aphorism "men mark when they hitte but never mark when they misse" supplies sufficient explanation. We believe in Mr. Bond's good faith, we also are prepared to believe in the good faith of Ignatius Donnelly, Mrs. Gallup and the rest of the Bacon-Shakespeare cipherists. If Mr. Bond, Mr. Donnelly or Mrs. Gallup were merely giving evidence of what their eyes had seen or their ears had heard there would be no reason to distrust them. The difficulty arises when we come to interpretations, identifications (of which there are many in *The Gate of Remembrance*) or, what is equally important, to the allowance to be made for the results of mere coincidence. In such cases people of this type of mentality seem to us to be absolutely untrustworthy. Lastly, we do not think that those who have read what has been written in *THE MONTH* during the last two years will accuse that journal of any attempt to "slur over the abnormal element and minimize as much as possible the tangible and normal facts (of psychism) which have come to light" in our times.

4—A DREAM STORY¹

MR. L. M'MANUS, whose work shows a practised hand, has, as many before him have sought to do, tried to find relief from the sadness and disappointment of the actual by dwelling upon what might have been. He imagines the growth in Ireland of a distinct indigenous civilization such as might have occurred

¹ *The Professor in Erin*. By L. M'Manus. Dublin: Gill and Son. Pp. iv. 242. Price, 5s. net.

had the Northern Earls won the day against Elizabeth and thus preserved their country's independence and kept it free from those successive iniquitous "plantings" which have been a main source of its woes. If the Battle of Kinsale in 1602 had been won by the native Irish, then, by the consolidation of the kingdom under Hugh O'Neill and its subsequent development in population and material resources, there *might* have grown up in the Western Seas a powerful state with its own laws, language, literature, and customs, making its own separate contribution to human civilization. This possibility of a normally-developed Ireland the author describes as an actuality, constructing a most ingenious story out of his abundant archaeological knowledge and filling it with the human interests of love and jealousy and ambition. The story is well worth reading on its own account, but perhaps its greatest value will be found in the light it throws on the sentiment of Irish nationality, which so many people, who are apt to regard the Sister Kingdom as a subject English province, find so unintelligible to-day. It explains the whole Gaelic movement and also the political ideal which lies at the source of Sinn Féin. With this dream in their heads and the conviction that it is still possible to realize it, the conduct of the young intransigents of the Irish nation is seen in a more intelligible light. For the picture of a Christian civilization here described has a fascination beyond words. We trust that this book will be widely read on this side of the Channel.

SHORT NOTICES

THEOLOGICAL.

WITH the publication of the last two volumes on the Sacraments—**Penance** (7s. net), **Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, Matrimony** (7s. net), and the *de novissimis* treatise, **Eschatology** (4s. 6d. net), the great enterprise of presenting a complete dogmatic theology in English has been happily accomplished by Mr. B. Herder of London. The twelve volumes (\$18 net) will claim an almost indispensable place in every busy priest's bookshelves, for they are excellently adapted to provide a clear, brief and accurate survey of the state of theological knowledge in every given department. And for the student who wants a conspectus of the ground before entering upon a detailed study they provide exactly what he needs, with full references to sources and longer treatises. The educated laity, too, may find here, unencumbered by technicalities, a plain exposition of the Faith they should be proud to defend. Mgr. Poble, the author of the compendium, and Mr. Arthur Preuss, who has translated it into readable English, are to be congratulated on the completion of a task which makes the English-speaking Catholic world their debtors. These concluding volumes yield to none in the interest and importance of their subject, and their treatment is marked by the same soundness, broadmindedness and moderation which is characteristic of the series as a whole.

It is now possible to see the completion of the translation of the *Summa* undertaken by the English Dominican Fathers. The work when finished will be comprised in seventeen volumes, of which twelve have already appeared. That before us is the second volume of the *Secunda-Secunda* (Washbourne: 7s. net), and deals with "Prudence" and "Justice," virtues at something of a discount in our modern world. The perusal of the latter treatise, for instance, which takes in all a man's relations with his neighbour, would serve to show how widely and how disastrously modern practice has departed from the Christian code. It is to be hoped that this worthy undertaking, which it is superfluous to praise, will continue to receive the support of the public and thus be brought to a triumphant conclusion.

A second edition of Mr. Charles Hart's *The Students' Catholic Doctrine* (Washbourne: 4s. net) although the first appeared only at the beginning of last year, is a sign that its usefulness is appreciated. The author has taken occasion to revise it carefully and thus to make it even more useful to students, catechists, converts and all who need a compendious exposition of the truths, moral and dogmatic, of the Faith.

Our Lord used the method of teaching by parables in order to test at once the good will and the intelligence of His hearers. It was not His purpose to set forth the "mysteries of the Kingdom of God" in theological terms but to clothe them in allegorical forms, easily intelligible by the sincere yet containing a vast range and depth of meaning. Hence, for those who wish to understand *Him*, an understanding of His parables is necessary and this Father Philip Coghlan's admirable little book, *The Parables of Jesus* (Washbourne: 2s. 6d. net), will put within their reach. It is sufficiently full and exhaustive by itself to satisfy the devout inquirer, though the student cannot afford to neglect Father Coleridge's masterly study of the subject nor even Father Maturin's illuminating treatise. The great work of Father Fonck, *Parables of the Gospels*, the most comprehensive of all, has also recently been made accessible in English.

The first volume of what promises to be a very complete discussion of the New Code has been published by Mr. Herder—*A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law* (Vol. I, 6s. net), by Rev. P. C. Augustine, O.S.B., D.D. The work will be completed in six volumes. The present one is concerned with introductory matter—the nature, history and sources of Canon Law—admirably treated, with copious bibliographies, and contains besides a discussion of the first six Titles (Cann. 1—86). The text of each Canon is given with a translation, and then follows the comment, longer or shorter according to need. The book is of a convenient shape, well printed and handsomely bound, and is sure to be popular.

PHILOSOPHY.

In the new edition, the fourth, of Father Joseph Rickaby's popular *Moral Philosophy* (Longmans: 7s. 6d. net), the author has been hampered somewhat by the natural desire not to alter the main features of a work in such common use and thus make this unusable with previous editions. So the alterations are confined mainly to two pages of *Addenda* and *Corrigenda*. Nowhere in English will the general reader find more brightly or plainly expressed the traditional principles on which Catholic ethics are founded, or a better corrective to the loose but pretentious thinking which confuses the modern mind. There has been a good deal of development and further

speculation since the work first appeared some twenty-eight years ago, and of course an immense volume of literature which the author has not been able to notice either in praise or blame, but the fundamental laws of conduct and the grounds of human obligation with which he deals are not subject to change with the passing of the years.

DEVOTIONAL.

Father Alban Goodier, S.J., does not allow his exile in India to hamper his apostolate of the pen. Two useful spiritual books of his are before us for review—*The Crown of Sorrow* (Washbourne : 2s. 6d. net), a series of meditations on the Passion, short but full of matter and setting in clear light many of the countless lessons of that divine tragedy, and *The School of Love and other Essays* (Examiner Press : Bombay) brief papers of a wider range, yet all with a spiritual outlook, the fruit of keen observation, feeling and analysis.

The first and the best of everything is due to God, the giver of all good, wherefore Sister Mary Philip of the "Bar" Convent, York, has aptly styled her little book of Meditations, *First Fruits* (Sands and Co. : 2s. 6d. net) for the day should always begin with prayer. There will be few so busy that they cannot use the materials for mental prayer provided here, for these meditations, concerned mainly with the life of our Lord, are short yet striking in their expression.

A little book in blue and gold, *The Holy Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, published by Messrs. Duffy, embodies a method of reciting that devotion which links it with the cult of other Saints, especially St. Gabriel and St. Joseph. The author, "Francis," has composed appropriate meditations and prayers for each decade.

BIOGRAPHY.

The Life of Pius X. (Washbourne : 3s. 6d. net) which Madame Forbes has added to her *Heroes of the Church* series, is a real spiritual romance, dealing as it does with the career of one who, born in a lowly condition, rose, by mere force of personality and exercise of virtue, to the highest position in Christendom, and who displayed, at every stage of his marvellous career, the same supernatural consistency of character. Even a bald recital of the events of such a life would prove interesting but, in Madame Forbes' skilled hands, the interest is deepened into fascination. The chapter which relates some of the miracles of the Pope will surprise those who do not know how numerous and well-authenticated they are. The little book is not only a record of the Pope's career but it gives, with abundance of anecdote and illustration, a clear account of the many religious and political crises which marked his pontificate.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Eucharistic Life (Longmans : 2s. 6d. net) gives the substance of a course of addresses given by the Rev. E. L. Strong and a fellow-member of the Oxford Mission Brotherhood at Calcutta, at the Students' Conference of the Syrian Christian Church held at Kottayam, in May, 1916. The Syrian Church in question is the ancient but schismatic Church on the Malabar coast, which is indeed of Syrian origin as regards its ecclesiastical status but with a membership entirely native. Mr. Strong in his Introduction gives an account of his visit to these people, their habits and

temperament, which is of interest, though he does not seem to know very accurately the curious phase in their history by which, originally Nestorian, they became without much consciousness of what they are doing, Monophysite after their short Uniat existence during the days of Portuguese domination simply because the Nestorians could not supply them with a Bishop while the Monophysites could. They are not a very educated group, but the Anglicans of the Oxford Mission have undertaken to instruct them. Hence these Lectures, the subject of which was selected because the members of this Church "have not realized as they should the primary purpose of the Eucharist."

P. Agostino Gemelli, O.F.M., of Turin, has brought out a third edition of a little brochure on *Il principio di Nazionalità e l'amor di Patria nella dottrina cattolica* (Libreria editrice internazional Torino: lir. 1.20). We had not as yet seen, when writing our Topics last month, Padre Gemelli's little essay, but we can conveniently refer to it now, as laying down the principles in which Catholic thinkers have viewed the subject.

We should like to give a more extended notice to Mr. E. J. Smith's important book *Race Regeneration* (King and Son: 7s. 6d. net), because his general treatment of the subject corresponds with that frequently adopted in the pages of this periodical. His views, aims and methods are Christian throughout and we find no taint of the eugenist in his recommendations. As Chairman of the Health Committee of the Bradford Corporation, one which has taken the lead amongst English municipalities in care for the children, he has expert knowledge and wide experience, and his book may be described as authoritative. It is a terrible indictment of a civilization dominated by misplaced and misused wealth: "the nation's abstract faith is Christian, its concrete practice is of Mammon"—and to Mammon for centuries there has been offered the sacrifice of countless innocent lives. The theme is the familiar one—Maternity and Child-Welfare—and its exposition follows the usual lines, pointing out the lack of the constituents of moral and physical health in the life conditions of the workers. The book is one to read and re-read and ponder over: no less than 85 excellent full-plate illustrations enforce its moral.

Italian has recently been advocated as a natural living Esperanto—a language easy to learn and to speak, and well fitted for international intercourse. Armed with Mr. Alfred Hoare's *Short Italian Dictionary* (Cambridge University Press: 9s.), no one need fear to test that claim. It is an abridgment of the author's well-known quarto work and is, therefore, only relatively "short," it contains a full list of irregular verbs, with their peculiarities—always the crux of a new language—and, moreover, it is turned out by the University Press in a way that, like the fatal apple, is "fair to the eyes and delightful to behold."

In *The Dartmoor Window Again* (Longmans: 6s. net) Miss Beatrice Chase continues her intimate confidences with the reader concerning her moorland home, her occupations and servants, her likes and dislikes, her visitors and acquaintances,—a *pot-pourri* of playful reminiscences mingled with picturesque descriptions.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

As past history contains the key to much that perplexes us to-day, the *Helps for Students of History*, which, written by experts in the several departments, are being published by the S.P.C.K. as sixpenny pamphlets,

deserve cordial welcome. The Series is projected to cover four great categories, viz., Methods of Historical Work, The Materials of History, Auxiliary Studies, Special Subjects and Periods. We trust that the Editors will see the justice and expediency of employing Catholic experts in regions where an inner knowledge of the Catholic faith and practice is essential. The publications of the Catholic Record Society, for instance, are well worth a careful survey. In the four pamphlets to hand, Mr. R. C. Fowler treats of *Episcopal Registers of England and Wales*, Mr. C. Johnson of *The Public Record Office*, Mr. R. L. Poole of *Medieval Reckonings of Time*, and Mr. F. J. C. Hearnshaw of *Municipal Records*. Each pamphlet contains between 40 and 50 pages.

The same enterprising Society sends a further instalment of its cheap *Texts for Students* series, which enables the ordinary learner to come into contact to some extent with original sources. The three volumes before us are *Selections from Matthew Paris* (9d. net), *Selections from Giraldus Cambrensis* (9d. net), both edited by Miss Caroline Skeel, Doc.Lit., and the *Latin Writings of St. Patrick* (6d. net), edited by Rev. N. J. D. White.

Amongst the books and pamphlets written in defence of the Pope, a list of which we printed in our July issue, we unaccountably omitted that on *Pope Benedict's Note to the Belligerents* from the pen of Abbot Ford, which originally appeared in *The Tablet* and has since been reprinted by *The Universe* (2d.). The Abbot confines himself to showing, which he does conclusively, that the secular Press, through its anti-Catholic bias and its ignorance of diplomatic form, misinterpreted the Note and that the Holy Father cannot be fairly said to be pro-German. To this must be added a pamphlet by a non-Catholic, *The Vatican and the Allies*, which was published first in the *Daily Telegraph* and is now available through the enterprise of the *Universe* as a pamphlet (5 for 1s., post free). This is valuable, as showing the importance from the merely common sense and mundane point of view of making friends with a world-wide and indestructible power like the Papacy.

The Catholic Truth Society, compelled alas! to go slow for want of financial motive power, has, nevertheless, lately issued three highly useful penny pamphlets—*The Knights of the Blessed Sacrament*, which gives the genesis, character and scope of a remarkable devotional crusade amongst youth; *Bagotry or Bigotry*, by Father Thurston, a title which as the contents show is not logically a "complete disjunctive": it deals with the kind of credit due to Mr. Richard Bagot, an anti-Catholic writer; and finally, *The Tramp*, by M. E. M. Young, a highly original and very subtly contrived allegorical story.

The July issues (Vol. XVI., Nos. 13 and 14) of *The Catholic Mind* (America Press: 5 cents each) contain *Ozanam's Ideals of Social Work*, by Professor Rahilly, *The Ethics of Irish Conscriptio*, by Dr. Coffey of Maynooth, *The Irish Bishops and Conscriptio*, by Bishop O'Donnell of Raphoe, the first instalment of a valuable *Catalogue raisonné of Books on Controversy and Apologetics*, compiled by John C. Reville, S.J. Only one August number, No. 16, has reached us, wherein the above list is continued: we are somewhat astonished to find no mention in it of the name and works of Father John Gerard, surely in the fields of science and history no mean "apologist."

The Manual of the Sodality of the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus (Washbourne: 6d. net) gives no details of the history of that Sodality, where and by whom it was instituted, and how it was composed and ruled. The

multiplication of new devotions is *a priori* to be deprecated, and one would like assurance of their authorization. The Manual contains a "Little Office of the Sacred Heart" which is certainly not that hitherto in use.

Three little devotional books from the French of Abbé Crayol, *Better than Silver or Gold*, *The Two Cities*, and *Heaven on Earth*, are sent to us by Messrs. Duffy, each priced at 2d.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- AMERICA PRESS, New York.
The Catholic Mind. Vol. XVI. Nos. 15 and 16.
- BLACKWELL, Oxford.
Psychism, Glastonbury and "The Month." By P. Hookham. Pp. 38. Price, 1s. 6d. net.
- BURNS & OATES, London.
Jesus in the Tabernacle. By E. J. N. Illustrated. Pp. 23.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.
Various Penny Pamphlets.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY OF IRELAND, Dublin.
Poets of the Faith. By J. M. Flood. Pp. 94. Price, 1s. 6d. net.
- DUFFY & Co., Dublin.
Three Twopenny Pamphlets.
- FONSECA, Bombay.
The School of Love. By A. Goodier, S.J. Pp. 148.
- HERDER, London.
The Sacraments. Vols. III. and IV. Pp. 270, 250. Price, 7s. net each.
Eschatology. Pp. 162. Price, 4s. 6d. net.
The concluding volumes of the "Pohle-Preuss" Dogmatic Theology. *A Commentary on Canon Law*. Vol. I. By the Rev. P. C. Augustine, O.S.B., D.D. Pp. 184. Price, 6s.
- LONGMANS, London.
The Priestly Vocation. By Bishop Ward. Pp. x. 175. Price, 5s. n.
Moral Philosophy. By J. Rickaby, S.J. New Edition. Pp. 380. Price, 7s. 6d. net.
- SANDS & Co., London.
First-Fruits. By Sister M. Philip. Pp. xv. 254. Price, 2s. 6d. net.
- S.P.C.K., London.
The Uncanonical Jewish Books. By W. J. Ferrar, M.A. Pp. 112. Price, 3s. net.
Episcopal Registers of England and Wales. By R. C. Fowler. Pp. 32. Price, 6d. net.
Municipal Records. By F. J. C. Hearnshaw. Pp. 46. Price, 6d. net.
Medieval reckonings of Time. By R. L. Poole. Pp. 47. Price, 6d. net.
The Public Record Office. By C. Johnson. Pp. 47. Price, 6d. net.
- 6d. net. *Libri Sancti Patricii*. Edited by Canon N. I. D. White. Pp. 32. Price, 6d. net. *The Sibylline Oracles*. Books III.—V. By Rev. H. N. Pate. Pp. 118. Price, 3s. 6d. net. *The Teaching Office of the Church*. Pp. vi. 172. Price, 2s. net.
- SUBIRANA, Barcelona.
Compendium Theologiae Moralis. By Father J. B. Ferreres, S.J. Eighth Edition. 2 Vols. Pp. xlv. 740; xii. 844.
- TALBOT & Co., London.
The World to Come. By W. Lowndes, M.A. Pp. 48.
- UNIVERSE OFFICE, London.
Pope Benedict's Note to the Belligerents. By Abbot Ford. Pp. 19. Price, 2d.
- CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
The Neo-Platonists. By Thomas Whittaker. Second Edition. Pp. xvi. 318.
- OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
The Saxon Bishops of Wells. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. Pp. 69. Price, 5s. net.
- WASHBOURNE, London.
The Summa Theologica. Translated by the Dominican Fathers. Part II. No. 2. Pp. 350. Price, 7s. n. *The Crown of Sorrow*. By A. Goodier, S.J. Pp. viii. 140. Price, 2. 6d. net. *Pius X*. By F. A. Forbes. Pp. x. 177. Price, 3s. 6d. net. *Letter to Catholic Priests*. From the Latin of Pius X. Pp. 31. Price, 6d. net. *Spiritual Exercises for Retreat*. By Rev. P. Dunoyer. Translated by E. Staniforth. Pp. xv. 478. Price, 6s. net. *The Dead Altars*. By M. Reynés-Monlaur. Translated by M. E. Arendrup. Pp. v. 192. Price, 3s. 6d. net. *The Student's Catholic Doctrine*. By C. Hart, B.A. Pp. xxi. 382. Price, 4s. net. *Missal for Sunday Use*. Pp. xxv. 1268. Price, 4s. net.
- ZIONIST ORGANISATION, London.
Zionism in the Bible. By N. Sokolow. Pp. 17. Price, 2d.
A Hebrew University for Jerusalem. By H. Sacher. Pp. 16. Price, 2d.

